

PROPERTY OF
THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY LIBRARY
GRADUATE
REFERENCE

BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS

Edited by the

REV. ARTHUR E. GREGORY

THE CHURCH OF THE WEST
IN THE
MIDDLE AGES

BY

HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A.

VOL. II.

London:

CHARLES H. KELLY

2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD.; AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1900

270.3
W 892
V. 2

BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

Editor: REV. ARTHUR E. GREGORY.

- The Epistles of Paul the Apostle.* A Sketch of their Origin and Contents. By GEORGE G. FINDLAY, B.A. Small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Seventh Thousand.
- The Theological Student.* A Handbook of Elementary Theology. With List of Questions for Self-Examination. By J. ROBINSON GREGORY. 2s. 6d. Twelfth Thousand.
- The Gospel of John.* An Exposition, with Critical Notes. By T. F. LOCKYER, B.A. 2s. 6d. Third Thousand.
- The Praises of Israel.* An Introduction to the Study of the Psalms. By W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d. Fourth Thousand.
- The Wisdom-Literature of the Old Testament.* By W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d. Third Thousand.
- From Malachi to Matthew:* Outlines of the History of Judea from 440 to 4 B.C. By Professor R. WADDY MOSS, Didsbury College, Manchester. 2s. 6d. Third Thousand.
- An Introduction to the Study of Hebrew.* By J. T. L. MAGGS, B.A., B.D. 5s.
- In the Apostolic Age:* The Churches and the Doctrine. By ROBERT A. WATSON, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d. Second Thousand.
- The Sweet Singer of Israel.* Selected Psalms with Metrical Paraphrases. By BENJAMIN GREGORY, D.D. 2s. 6d.
- The Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch.* By WILLIAM SPIERS, M.A., F.G.S., etc. 8s. 6d. Second Thousand.
- A Manual of Modern Church History.* By Professor W. F. SLATER, M.A. 2s. 6d. Second Thousand.
- An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek, with Reader.* By J. HOPE MOULTON, M.A. 3s. 6d. Second Thousand.
- The Ministry of the Lord Jesus.* By THOMAS G. SELBY. 2s. 6d. Fourth Thousand.
- The Books of the Prophets:* In their Historical Succession. By GEORGE G. FINDLAY, B.A. Vol. I. To the Fall of Samaria. 2s. 6d. Third Thousand.
- Scripture and its Witnesses.* A Manual of Christian Evidence. By Professor J. S. BANKS. 2s. 6d. Second Thousand.
- The Old World and the New Faith:* Notes on the Historical Narrative of the Acts. By W. F. MOULTON, M.A. 2s. 6d. Second Edition.
- Studies in Comparative Religion.* By Professor A. S. GEDEN, M.A. 2s. 6d.
- The Divine Parable of History.* A Concise Exposition of the Revelation of St. John. By H. ARTHUR SMITH, M.A. 2s. 6d.
- A History of Lay Preaching in the Christian Church.* By JOHN TELFORD, B.A. 2s. 6d.
- The Church of the West in the Middle Ages.* By HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A. Two Volumes. 2s. 6d. each.
- The Development of Doctrine in the Early Church.* By PROFESSOR J. SHAW BANKS. 2s. 6d.

LONDON: CHARLES H. KELLY, 2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD., E.C.
April 1900.

THE CHURCH OF THE WEST

IN THE

MIDDLE AGES

BY

HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A.

VOL. II.

*FROM THE DEATH OF ST. BERNARD (1153)
TO THE TRANSFER OF THE PAPACY TO AVIGNON
AND THE DEATH OF CLEMENT V. (1314)*

London:

CHARLES H. KELLY

2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD.; AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1900

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary

ERRATA IN VOLUME I.

For Mohammed, Mohammedan, Moslem, read Mohammad, Muslim. For Roscellin, read Roscelin; Wiclif, read Wyclif.

P. 60. JULES ROY'S *L'An Mille* has convinced me that this idea of the Millennium was invented in the sixteenth century.

P. 64. GEE and HARDY, etc. To "It is a translation and selection," add "so far as the period carried by this chapter is concerned." For Stokes' *Celtic Church*, read *Ireland and the Celtic Church*.

P. 67. See HUNT, *English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*—an excellent new work.

P. 74. Dele "Netley." Nutsall is probably near Winchester.

P. 83. The lives of Cyril and Methodius must be rewritten in the light of recent Russian research. See BURY'S *Gibbon*, vi. App. 12.

P. 96. For BOWMAN, read BOWDEN. So p. 128, n.

P. 98. "absolutely an isolated case." Professor Collins has pointed out to me that the letters of Gerbert (Ed. Havet) are full of this revolt. But Arnulf was only the mouthpiece of Gerbert, as I have stated.

P. 127, n. Dele. The whole documents of the investiture controversy should be studied in DÖBERL or HENDERSON.

P. 132, n. "First printed by Poole." A critic in *The Athenæum* points out that the letter is in FLOTO, in the *Monumenta Germaniae*.

P. 176, n. Add App. F. in COLLINS, *The Beginnings of English Christianity* (the whole work is of interest).

P. 206, n. Add. *Virgil in the Middle Ages*, by Professor Comparetti. Translated by Benecke.

P. 212, n. According to HARNACK, *Dogma*, p. 425, first word by Hildebert of Tours.

P. 231. 3rd line from bottom. Read for "Anselm," Abailard.

P. 234. "to the Bogomiles of Bulgaria." This seems scarcely correct. See LEA, *Inquisition*, i. 90 n.; BURY'S *Gibbon*, vi. App. 9.

P. 279. "Virgil on Livy" read Virgil or Livy.

P. 307. LEADER SCOTT, *The Cathedral Builders*, would lead me to modify this. Nevertheless, the horrors are there, e.g. her first illustration.

PREFACE



IN this second and concluding volume I bring down the story of the Church of the West in the "Middle Ages" to the transfer of the Papacy to Avignon. History, as Freeman has taught us, is continuous, and all breaks are unreal. Nevertheless, the transfer of the Papacy marks the virtual close of the "Middle Ages," and the beginning of a new epoch. With this new chapter in the history of the Church of Christ I purpose dealing in a future study of the Reformation, using the word to indicate not merely the resultant, but the various divergent forces of which it was the outcome. For the Reformation that succeeded is one with, and can only be understood by its relation to the reformation that failed; Wyclif must not be isolated from Luther, nor Constance from

Worms. But if further defence be needed for ending the "Middle Ages" with Avignon, I must refer the reader to what I have written on pp. 296-308.

My object in this and other volumes will not be so much to give the details of events,—for this I shall refer the reader to suitable "Authorities,"—as to indicate the forces and tendencies, external and internal, whereby the Church has been moulded for good or evil. I write under the conviction that history is a progress and not a cycle, and that every generation contributes something to the spiritual heritage of mankind. Such progress involves the continuity of the one life of the Spirit manifesting Himself in different ways in different ages. Controversy, therefore, is far from my purpose. The business of the historian is to put his readers into the standpoint of the past; not to throw mud from the dunghills of pride. It does not become the heirs of all the ages to find nothing but blame for the centuries into whose labours they have entered, by whose mistakes they have profited. The Pharisee may stand in the porch of History as well as in the Temple of God.

To the critics of my first volume I return thanks for their uniform kindness. I crave indulgence for a task carried on amid many duties. I should perhaps explain that I make no pretension to study of the original "sources" except by the verification in MIGNE, etc., of quotations, and the satisfying myself that they are not wrongly applied. Here and there I have ventured on a translation of my own. *The reader should note that quotations from original sources are enclosed within ' . . . ' while quotations from modern writers are enclosed in the usual " . . . " This distinction must be borne in mind throughout Volume II. Unfortunately, it was disregarded by the printers in Volume I.*

The notes will be confined to pointing out to the reader lines on which he can prosecute his studies, especially over matters which my narrow margins compel me to omit. The "Authorities" are intended to help the young student, and are therefore, with few exceptions, confined to English authors. The comments I have added are strictly personal. Other writers might differ in their estimate of the various books. Those who desire wider reading will find all they need in

CHEVALIER'S *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du M. A.* (1877, with supplement bringing it down to 1888). For the study of "sources," POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca M. A. Historica* (1896), is indispensable. To it, therefore, I refer the student once for all. Some acquaintance with the originals is advisable and easy. DÖBERL, *Monumenta Germaniae Selecta* (3 vols. only published), is cheap and excellent. This is in Latin; but HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents of the M. A.*, is a useful translation, with a somewhat wider range. A work like Döberl for England is sadly needed. The ROLLS' SERIES is in every library, but deters by its size. A useful little volume is GEE and HARDY, *Documents illustrative of English Church History* (translated). Those who intend to study "sources" (*Quellenkunde*) should begin with the following introductions. BALZANI, *Early Chroniclers of Italy*; MASSON, *ditto of France*; GAIRDNER, *ditto of England*. They are profitable also for the general reader. Every student should constantly consult a good historical atlas. The superb CLARENDON PRESS ATLAS (especially strong in its ecclesiastical maps), or the older SPRUNER-

MENKE, should be in every public library. The private reader may content himself with FREEMAN. A cheap historical atlas, 24 maps, is published by JUSTUS PERTHES (Gotha) (2 m. 40 pf.)

The development of Doctrine in the M. A. falls outside my purpose. The student should consult the works of HARNACK. A smaller book is FISHER, *History of Christian Doctrine*, in my opinion not altogether satisfactory. I am glad to be able to announce that my friend Professor BANKS is engaged on a little volume complementary to the present, which will deal with the development of doctrine from St. Augustine to the Reformation in a concise yet ample manner.

One word in conclusion as to general histories of the Church. Their name is legion. In my opinion the best is still MILMAN (9 vols.). If antiquated, it is not yet superseded, though it needs correction on almost every page. He is weakest in doctrine and philosophy, and should here be supplemented by NEANDER (10 vols.), who is also always faithful to the continuity of life. HARDWICK, *Church History*, is a useful

summary (chiefly of Neander), with valuable notes by Bishop Stubbs. MOSHEIM is out of date ; if used at all, the edition should be with notes by Bishop Stubbs. Of the others, GIESELER (5 vols.) is often valuable for documents, etc. GREENWOOD, *Cathedra Petri* (6 vols.), is a laborious work, of little value through lack of sympathy. Those who desire to see a frank R.C. view will find in ALZOG (3 vols.) a scholarly work, with good bibliography (various translations ; I have used the Dublin, but of its merits as a translation I cannot speak). Of text-books, MOELLER (Trans. Rutherford ; excellent *Quellenkunde*, though lacking reference to English works) is the most modern and satisfactory. Of the others, KURTZ and FISHER are both good. I cannot speak from knowledge of either ROBERTSON (7 vols.) or CROOKS, *Story of the Christian Church*. This last (an American work) has won praise from Professor Banks. But I would recommend the student not to waste his time over diverse general histories. Let him fix on one, preferably a large work with some style about it, like Milman, and then read along with it judicious monographs, such as are indicated in the following pages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



PART IV

ROMA VICTRIX



CHAPTER I

THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE

	PAGE
§ I. The Two Stages of the Latin Patriarchate—Causes of Hildebrand's Success—His Political Theories—Manegold—John of Salisbury—Thomas Aquinas—Roman Jacobins—The Weakness of the Empire—The <i>Translation of the Empire</i> . § II. Frederic I.—Adrian IV.—Romances of the Papacy—A Modern Sennacherib—"The Company of Death"—Alexander III.—The Heiress Constance—Otto and his Scullions—Frederic II.—His Character—Gregory IX.—Innocent IV.—The Death-struggle—The Lack of a Printing-press—A Captive General Council—The Fall of Frederic—Rudolf of Hapsburg—A.E.I.O.U. § III. Causes of the Fall—Cast-iron Conservatism—'Crassus' our Dictator'—Results of the Fall—Solidarity and Nationalism—The Possibility of the Reformation	1-44

CHAPTER II

MOHAMMAD OR CHRIST

- § I. Indifference to the Crusades—Mohammad and Gregory—The Dogs of War—Amr and Okba—The Conquest of Spain. § II. Charles Martel—The Destruction of St. Peter's—The Coming of the Normans—Wiscard—The Dream of Hildebrand—Pilgrimages—The Value of Constantinople—Absentee Landlords—'Deus Vult.' § III. The Failure of the Crusades—Sea-power—Schism and Hatred—The Greed of Venice—The Fall of Acre—Hordes of Mongolians. § IV. Results of the Crusades—Military Orders—Intolerance—The Deliverance of Spain—'The Winning Cause' . . . 45-80

CHAPTER III

INNOCENT III.

- § I. Value of his Reign—A Test Case—His Rare Fortune. § II. His Work in Italy—In Germany. § III. In France—John—Stephen Langton—The Interdict—The English Canossa—Magna Carta. § IV. The Fourth Crusade—'Worse than Dogs'—Its Results. —§ V. The Cathari—Beziers—The Spoil of Toulouse—The Verdict of History . . . 81-112

CHAPTER IV

THE CHAINS OF THE LAW

- § I. The Medieval Theory of Law—Relation to Feudalism—Relation to the Church—The Idea of a Corporation—Growth of Church Law—and Courts Christian—

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
Revival of Roman Law—Canon Law—Gratian— Henry and Becket. § II. The Sphere of Canon Law —Conflict with the State—Immunity of Clerks— “Benefit of Clergy”—Its Effects—Verdict of Luther. § III. Influence of the Canon Law—Professional- ism in the Church—The Penitentials—Penance— Effects of the Doctrine—The Exaltation of the Papacy—Appellate Jurisdiction—‘Impetration’— The Claims of Rome—National Churches—Action of Henry VIII. § IV. The Inquisition—Toleration —Medieval Standpoint—Teaching of Aquinas—The Crime of the Inquisition—Its Results—Influence on Jurisprudence—and Morality—Her Unpardonable Sin	113-160

PART V

THE CONTINUITY OF LIFE

CHAPTER V

DARKNESS AND DAWN

- § I. The Peril of the Church—Causes—Degradation of
Wealth—*Goliath*—Vicars—Origin of—Evil of the
System—State of the Monasteries—Abbot Samson—
The Weakness of Monasticism—Ease in Zion. § II.
The Growth of Heresy—Growth of Towns—Lepers
—The Cathari—Origin—Doctrines—Ritual—Effect
of their Teaching—Causes of Success—Languedoc—
—The Waldensians—Origin—Doctrines—Why they
Failed. § III. The Continuity of Life—Chivalry—
The Quest of the Grail—The Military Orders—The
Shifting of Monastic Ideals—Mysticism—Its

	PAGE
Nature—Dionysius—His Influence—Prophetism—	
Joachim di Fiori— <i>The Everlasting Gospel</i>	161-204

CHAPTER VI

THE COMING OF THE FRIARS

§ I. Dominic and Francis—Jacques de Vitry—Life of Dominic.	§ II. Francis — Birth — Conversion — Religious Growth—Call—His Ideal—The Little Brothers — Persecution — Their Sermons — The Children's Crusade—Ugolini—Brother Elias—Zealots and Moderates—The Lost Ideal—Death of Francis — of Dominic.	§ III. The Character of Francis—Joyousness—Jacopone da Todi—Thomas of Celano— <i>Dies Iræ</i> —'My Sisters the Larks'—Sermon to the Birds—Contrast to St. Paul—Unity of his Character—His Unconsciousness of Difficulty—Dread of Learning—Intellectual Influence of the Friars—Friar Bacon—England and the Franciscans.	§ IV. Secret of Francis' Influence—Revival of the Laity—St. Louis and Brother Giles—Francis and Wesley—Results of the Movement—Social Democracy—Verdict of History	205-248
--	---	---	--	---------

PART VI

THE FALL OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY

CHAPTER VII

THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITIES

§ I. The Middle Ages and the Nineteenth Century—Revival of Learning—The Fall of the Monasteries—	
--	--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xv

	PAGE
The School of Notre Dame—The Growth of the University—Meaning of the Term—Policy of the Papacy—The Rise of Bologna—The Study of Law—A Student-University—Migrations—Prague—The End of Internationalism. § II. Religious Atmosphere—The Lay Spirit—Indirect Results—The Character of their Teaching—Aristotle—Causes of his Influence—Contrasted with Plato—Influence of Thomas Aquinas	249-280

CHAPTER VIII

BONIFACE VIII. AND CLEMENT V.

§ I. The Jubilee—Fall of the Papacy—Charles of Anjou—Celestine V.—Boniface VIII.—Relations with Edward I.— <i>Clericis Laicos</i> —The Appeal of Scotland— <i>Unam Sanctam</i> —Philip—The Tragedy of Anagni—Clement V.—Avignon. § II. Causes of the Fall—The Medieval Church—The Rise of the Nation—Imperialism and Nationalism—The Conflict of the Two Ideas—Illustrations from Monasticism—The Fall of the Templars—Summary of the Issues	281-308
--	---------

APPENDIX, ...	309
A CHRONOLOGICAL CHURCH ROLL	311
INDEX TO VOLUMES I. AND II.	315

PART IV

ROMA VICTRIX

CHAPTER I

THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE

*Rome, that turned it unto good,
Was wont to boast two suns, whose several beams
Cast light on either way, the world's and God's.
One since hath quenched the other; and the sword
Is grafted on the crook; and so conjoin'd
Each must perforce decline to worse, unaw'd
By fear of other.*

PURG., xvi. 109-116.

AUTHORITIES. — § 1. BRYCE, POOLE, *Illustrations Medieval Thought*, cc. 7, 8, 9. FISHER, *Medieval Empire* (a scholarly new work which supplements rather than supersedes Bryce; stiffer reading). Documents in DÖBERL, *Monumenta Germaniae Selecta*, iii., iv., and v.

§ 2. For ADRIAN IV., BP. CREIGHTON in *Dict. Eng. Biog.*, and excellent *Life of Adrian IV.* by A. H. TARLETON. For the Frederics, FREEMAN, *Essays*, vol. ii. KINGTON OLIPHANT, *Life of Frederic II.* (2 vols). Of REUTER's *Alexander III.* and FELTEN's *Gregory IX.* (excellent), no translation. This last a want. MILMAN and GREGOROVIVS are very full on the whole period. The first needs care. For the "Capture of the General Council," see *Eng. Hist. Review*, vol. vi.

§ 3. The general history of the struggle of the Hohenstaufen may be read in any of the following works. TOUT, *The Empire and the Papacy*, or the smaller UGO BALZANI, *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen* (Epoch Series), or HENDERSON, *Germany during the Middle Ages* (excellent). EMERTON, *Medieval Europe*, cc. ix., x. (good survey of general history of Middle Ages, with ample bibliography). For INNOCENT III., see c. 3, *infra*. For Becket, see note p. 125, and for Dante, note p. 37.

THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE

I

IN our former volume we traced the rise of the papal supremacy from the earliest days to the victory of Hildebrand. We noted how the federal idea dominant in the Early Church slowly passed into an autocracy. Instead of the federation of bishoprics under metropolitans, of provinces under primates, and of patriarchates equal in dignity and authority, we have the doctrine of the Holy Roman Empire, with its one supreme spiritual emperor, the Pope. Federalism has given place to the seamless unity of an absolute Papacy.

In this transformation of the Latin Patriarchate there were two stages. The first was the establishment of its spiritual supremacy, the beating down into subjection to itself of the rival elements within the Church. For the most part this was the work of the popes before Gregory VII. They succeeded because in reality the Church had no choice between local anarchy

and a controlling central power. The task of Hildebrand lay in a second and more difficult direction. He dreamed of establishing the supremacy of the Papacy over the outer world. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw his vision turned into accomplished fact; the opening years of the fourteenth witnessed its virtual overthrow.

For the Papacy the twelfth century, from the Concordat of Worms (i. 143), was a time of quiet growth in power. To the reader glancing down the list of the popes, and noting that with two exceptions they seem men of average ability, this may seem remarkable. But herein lies one secret of papal success. Secular monarchies were dependent for progress and consolidation upon the character of their sovereigns. The most carefully organised schemes, the most complete conquests, were liable to reversal when the strong man armed was succeeded on the throne by a weakling. Not so with the Holy See. Though here as elsewhere we find the law of ebb succeeding flow, the ebbs were brief, and were always followed by a fuller tide. A body of tradition and public opinion, a trained civil service, a system of jurisprudence, all of which were as yet lacking to the secular monarchs, rendered the power of

the papal throne largely independent of its special occupant. But most of all was its strength amid weakness due to the definite principles inherited from Hildebrand. In the tradition which ascribes the rapid rise of Russia to the systematic working out of the plans of conquest outlined in his will by Peter the Great we have a modern example of the value to a State of a fixed policy. So with the Papacy. What Rome needed in succeeding popes was not so much daring ingenuity or brilliant talent as steady insistence upon the carrying out in minutest detail of the Master-builder's designs. A succession of Hildebrands would have proved as disastrous as the triumphs of Napoleon. The result would have been a league of Europe, and a papal Waterloo. But the good fortune of Rome did not desert her: by a series of second-rate though respectable popes she slowly consolidated her victories. The next age gave her the harvest of her quiet toil. In the thirteenth century we see the ripe fruit not only of Roman domination, but also of the spiritual life of the medieval Church. The popes for the first and last time ruled the world, a world of marvellous enthusiasms, and boundless visions springing from a soil saturated with lust and blood.

In the dream of Hildebrand the central idea

was the supremacy of the spiritual over the secular power. The old alliance of Church and State as equal powers in one system was alien to his thoughts; he would only admit of the State as a dependent department of the Church. In his utter contempt for kings and princes the carpenter's son reminds us rather of the Jacobins of the French Revolution than of a child of feudal times. 'Kings and dukes'—so he wrote to Bishop Hermann of Metz—"owe their origin to men guilty of every crime, ignorant of God and swayed by the devil."¹ There was no concession, in fact, that Gregory would not have made to democratic theory, provided democracy would have acknowledged his claims and done his bidding. His deposition of Henry iv. "marked in a very significant way the partial triumph of a new idea about the basis of sovereignty."² For one hundred and fifty years the teaching of Hildebrand was repeated almost without contradiction by every theorist of Europe. 'A king,' we read, 'is not a name of nature but

¹ Milman (iv. 128) makes nonsense of the passage from Hermann of Metz. For *aptante super pacis* read *agitante super pares*. The whole letter should be studied in Döberl, *op. cit.* iii. 40-48, translated in Henderson, *S. D.*, pp. 394-405.

² Fisher, *op. cit.* 57, who points out that there sprang up a large pamphlet literature, filling three volumes of the *Monumenta Germaniae*, in support of this doctrine of contract.

a title of office, nor does the people exalt him so high above it in order to give him the free power of playing the tyrant in its midst, but to defend it from tyranny. If one should engage a man for a fair wage to tend swine,'—the simile, as Dr. Poole observes, is not flattering,—'and he find means not to tend but to steal them, would one not remove him from his charge?' The words are the words of Manegold, a priest of Alsace, but the voice seems the voice of Rousseau.

Manegold may be dismissed as an extravagant, but John of Salisbury¹ cannot be so regarded. The pupil of Abailard, the secretary of Becket, the intimate friend of Adrian IV., the agent by whom Henry obtained the latter's sanction for his conquest of Ireland, John of Salisbury was one of the foremost scholars and thinkers of his age. In his *Polycraticus* John makes the first real attempt since Augustine to frame a theory of politics, but his basis is the strict subordination of the secular to the spiritual. 'The prince,' he claims, 'is the servant of the priesthood.' 'Vain is the authority of all laws except they bear the image of the divine law; and useless is the decree of a prince unless it be conformable to the discipline of the Church.' In some respects he is even a more advanced Jacobin

¹ For John of Salisbury (1115?–1180), see Poole, *op. cit.* c. 7.

than Manegold, and lays down with peculiar emphasis the duty not only of deposing but even of slaying tyrants. The greater part of his work would have commended itself fully to Cromwell's Ironsides; any difference of opinion would have centred round the nature of the spiritual power that is supreme.

In Thomas Aquinas we deal with the most systematic intellect of the Middle Ages. His *Rule of Princes*—the greater part is from his pen—was the accepted text-book of political philosophy. In this work we find Thomas laying down the supreme authority of the Pope, in whom alone is realised the unity of the Church, and the presence of the divine government, to whom also the people may look for checking the arbitrary action of kings. A papal excommunication, he argues, releases at once all subjects from their oath of allegiance. He is, of course, too subtle a thinker to adopt the wild notions of Manegold, or the popular idea emphasised by Gregory that civil authority, as distinct from the rule of the Church, was the result of the Fall. His conclusions as to the sphere of government—for instance, the duty of the State to provide for the education of all its members, and to see that no citizen shall suffer want—are on the whole remarkable anticipations

of modern theories. This fact enables us to form a better idea of his vast influence. Men felt that Thomas was lifting up before them a vision of the future, the nobler elements of which they clearly realised; but the foundation of this Utopia was the supremacy of the popes, and not the worn-out imperial conception.

In teaching like this — and our limits alone prevent us from illustrating the same tendency in other writers—we find not only the political programme of the Church but one of the secrets of papal success. He who would find the bases of political institutions, or the causes of social movement, will not discover them in striking events or brilliant actions. These are effects, not causes; and the foundations of social structure are generally unseen. For the world is governed by ideas, and the men of action are but the instruments whereby ideas they have not originated take concrete shape. So in the domination of Rome. Her dominion is inexplicable if we judge only by surface results and movements. In reality Christendom obeyed the Pope, in spite of itself, because the truer instinct of Christendom realised that the only existing theories of government that did not rest upon the basis of individualism or force were the ideas and systems that started with the

supreme authority of the Papacy as the first axiom.

Now, "ideas obtain authority and dominion not altogether from their intrinsic truth, but rather from their constant asseveration, especially when they fall in with the common hopes and fears, the wants and necessities of human nature. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor ability to examine them; they fatigue and so compel the world into their acceptance; more particularly if it is the duty of one great associated body to perpetuate them, while it is neither the peculiar function nor the manifest advantage of any large class or order to refute them."¹ So, on the contrary, when the Papacy fell, it fell not merely because of its crimes and follies; men had become conscious of new ideas which reversed the hierarchical teaching of the past—new ideas upon which the new nationalism and its rulers found it expedient to insist. To this we shall return in a later chapter.

The student, remembering the emphasis laid in the former volume on the theory of the Holy Roman Empire, may ask, Why did not Europe rally round the Empire as a defence against the despotism of Rome? Here, he may argue, is an idea whose potency is demonstrated by

¹ Milman, v. 169.

its long existence, splendid alike in heritage and possibilities. The answer is of importance. In the first place, the idea of the Empire was a fiction, or rather the foundations of the little reality it possessed lay in the sands of dreams and hopes; the Papacy was a fact built on the rock of spiritual need. In the famous figure of Hildebrand, the Papacy and the Empire were 'the two lights in the firmament of the militant Church,' but the Empire was the moonlight, shining with rays "borrowed, feeble, often interrupted"; the Papacy shone in all the brilliance of transcendent spiritual interests. In the next place, the rising democracies and nationalities of Western Europe, as well as the turbulent aristocracy of Germany, blindly welcomed pretensions which at first seemed merely to threaten a world-power more dangerous to themselves than the supremacy of the popes. France, for instance,—whose history, until happily checked by the disaster of Sedan, is the systematic plunder of the Empire,—welcomed any attack upon the neighbour whom her instinct singled out as her foe, her ambition as her victim. Then, again, there was a weak place in the theory of the Empire upon which the Papacy had ingeniously seized. The student will remember the difficulty which thinkers felt

as regards the re-establishment of the Empire under Charles the Great: by what right had the crown been transferred from the existing sovereign at Constantinople? That Charles himself was not satisfied with his position is evident from his desire to marry the Empress Irene. Only when that project failed did men seriously argue that the throne was vacant because of the usurpation of a woman. They added that Charles was called to the throne 'by the will of the Roman people' under the 'inspired prompting' of their spokesman, Leo III.

In the twelfth century papalist and imperialist sought to improve upon this theory for their own ends. The Papacy claimed that the validity of the coronation was due to the official act of the Pope. Innocent III. actually exalted this fiction, *the Translation of the Empire* as it was called, into an article of faith. "Henceforward it was the shield behind which the popes fought; it entered into all polemics, and all history-books down to and beyond the close of the Middle Ages." The consequences of this great falsification of history were self-evident. What one pope had given another could take away; at every vacancy the empire reverted to his hands; and without his sanction all elections

were null and void. On the other hand, the great Swabian emperors cared little for either 'the will of the Roman people,' or the 'inspired promptings' of the popes. They claimed that 'the empire was theirs by the right of conquest,' that their power was of God alone, and their office as sacred as that of their rival. Barbarossa significantly reminded the Pope that even our Lord Himself had through Peter paid tribute to Cæsar. He bids Adrian beware of 'the detestable monster of pride which had crept' into the sacred chair. Thus the alliance of two equal and co-ordinate authorities, the spiritual and secular, upon which the Holy Roman Empire had originally rested, had drifted into the opposition of two incompatible systems, one of which was bound to destroy the other. The fall of the Empire is in fact the great event of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and its results are all-important for the development of the Church. But in so speaking we are really looking at history from a modern standpoint. Europe itself seems to have been profoundly unconscious of the real meaning of the struggle between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufen, and in this very unconsciousness lay one element of papal success. The awakening of the nations was yet to come.

II

The victory of the Papacy was not obtained over weaklings and puppets. The battle was one of giants. Frederic I., better known by his Italian nickname of Barbarossa, is, perhaps, "the noblest type of medieval character, in many of its shadows, in all its lights." As a man of force he appeals to Carlyle: "A magnificent magnanimous man, holding the reins of the world not quite in the imaginary sense, scourging anarchy down, and urging noble effort up, really on a grand scale."¹ Frederic, in fact, was the strongest man that had worn the crown of the Cæsars since Charles the Great, to whom he rejoiced to be compared, and whose canonisation he procured. Nor was his antagonism to the Papacy due to any religious indifference. "'Woe is me, my son has perished, then?'" said he once, tears wetting the beard now white enough. 'My son is slain! But Christ still lives. Let us on, my men!'" Like the rest of Europe, he was profoundly stirred by Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem (1189), and must needs set off in his seventieth year to do battle for the sepulchre of Christ. On reaching the Salef, as the army was crossing by a narrow bridge, the aged

¹ Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, i. 70-72.

Emperor, impatient of the delay, plunged into the river, and was carried away by the flood.

Though most of the objects for which Barbarossa toiled are utterly alien to the modern spirit, Germany has done right in claiming him for her half-mythic hero. In the evil days that followed the fall of his house his reign stood out in men's dreams as the golden age of unity and strength. To him the Free Cities of the Empire—in later days the ever active centres of liberty and culture—traced their first charters; while in the tradition of the peasants, Frederic, like Arthur, is immortal. They are right. In the devotion of his life to the national cause he still lives, "not yet dead, but only sleeping within the hill near Salzburg yonder." "When tyranny seemed unendurable and anarchy endless, men sighed for the day when the long sleep of the just Emperor should be broken, and his shield be hung aloft again as of old in the camp's midst, a sign of help to the poor and oppressed" (Bryce).

Nor were the other antagonists of Rome foemen unworthy of her steel. Henry VI., the son of Frederic,—he who imprisoned for two years our Richard,—it is true, was devoid of all the nobler qualities of his father, and stands out pre-eminent by his cruelty even in a cruel age. But in insight and resource he had no equal

among the monarchs of the time, save in his son and successor, Frederic II.

The genius of the Swabian emperors was matched by the ability of the bishops of Rome. Alexander III., Innocent III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV. are among the greatest popes the Papacy has produced; in character, learning, and intention, true successors of Hildebrand. The first antagonist of Barbarossa was the Englishman, Adrian IV. The life of Nicholas Breakspear of Abbots - Langley is one of those romances of which the Papacy supplies not a few.¹ His father on turning monk of St. Albans seems to have left his lad without a protector. So the homeless boy begged his way to France, studied at Arles, and entered as a menial the house of the Canons Regular of

¹ Such romances must be taken into account in any estimate of the causes of papal strength. As one secret of Napoleon's success lay in the belief that every soldier carried in his knapsack a marshal's baton, so with the Papacy. The poorest scholar could dream of being the Lord of Rome and Vicar of Christ, at whose feet even his own sovereign would kneel. This, too, in an age of feudalism. I give here instances of remarkable rise, though all are not equally substantiated. Gregory VII. (carpenter), Benedict XII. (baker), Nicholas IV. (?peasant), Nicholas V. (poor doctor), Celestine V. and Sixtus IV. (peasants), Urban IV. and John XXII. (cobblers), Benedict XI. (shepherd), Sixtus V. (swineherd), Alexander V. and Adrian IV. (beggars).

St. Rufus near Valence. In course of time he rose to be the abbot, but the strictness of his discipline was too much for the easy-going chapter. They trumped up some charge against him, and appealed to Rome. Eugenius III. saw that his talents and character were being wasted, so detained him at his court, and sent him as legate to Norway. There he raised Trondhjem into a metropolitan see, and freed the Norwegian churches from their dependence on Bremen.

On arriving home, Nicholas was at once unanimously elected to the sacred chair (1154). So now the former beggar of St. Albans is the head of Christendom, behind whose palfrey even Frederic must walk at a stone's throw, and from whom our Henry II. is glad to receive the gift of Ireland! No one was more conscious of the responsibility and pre-eminence of his office. 'The Pope's tiara,' he said, 'is splendid, but it burns with fire.' He had not risen from the dust to be the head of the Church that he might meekly surrender her claims to those whom he dubbed 'the flies of Pharaoh.' In his grant to Henry he asserted that 'all islands on which Christ the sun of justice shall shine belong of right to the jurisdiction of Peter.'¹

¹ The gift has been doubted. But see Tarleton, *op. cit.* c. ix. For the bull, see Henderson, *S. D.*, p. 10. For its

We have seen elsewhere (i. 241) the way in which he crushed Arnold of Brescia, nor would he crown Frederic until he consented to act as his groom. On the outbreak of the inevitable quarrel, only the death of Adrian at Anagni (1159) saved the Emperor from excommunication: 'The chair of Peter,' he threatened, 'has given and can withdraw its gifts.' He passed away bequeathing to his successor a hazardous conflict, and pouring out to his friend and countryman, John of Salisbury, the woes of his position: 'Is there elsewhere in the world a man so miserable as the Pope? I have found so much hardship on the papal throne that all the bitterness of my past life seems sweet in comparison. Truly it is with justice that he is called the Servant of Servants.'

The death of Adrian was followed by a long and doubtful schism, apparently a struggle of rival pontiffs, in reality a supreme effort on the part of the Emperor to recover by this familiar expedient the old pre-eminence. The head of the German faction in the College of Cardinals

relation to the Donation of Constantine, see Döllinger, *Fables*, c. vi. The student should notice the incident at Besançon, when Adrian claimed that the empire was a "benefice." See documents in full in Döberl, iv. § 35, or trans. in Henderson, *op. cit.* pp. 410-419.

was at once recognised by Frederic, while Roland of Siena,—Alexander III., the zealous champion of papal absolutism,—the elect of the majority, was forced to flee to the protection of the King of Sicily. We need not follow Alexander in his wanderings, whether as an exile to France, or later, when the Romans swung round to his side and welcomed him back to their city. There he sought security in the stronghold of the Coliseum, fortified St. Peter's, equipped its roof with catapults, and in other ways prepared for the attack of Frederic (July 1187). For eight days the cathedral held out against assault, but at length its gates were battered in, and its defenders cut down. When further resistance was hopeless, Alexander fled disguised as a pilgrim, leaving Frederic and his anti-pope to sing their *Te Deums* of victory in the desecrated church. The rejoicings were premature ; Frederic, like a modern Sennacherib,—the comparison first occurs in the letters of Becket,—was stricken down by the destroying angel of Roman fever, once again a more potent defence than the walls of Aurelian. Within a week the flower of his army had perished, the Germans were seized with terror, and Frederic hastily retreated to his faithful Pisa.

But the Emperor's mistakes were even more

fatal than the Roman malaria. He had commenced his reign by crushing Arnold of Brescia; a wiser policy would have used the demagogue as a tool wherewith to thwart the popes in their own home. He completed his error by causing the rising democracies of Italy to see in the Papacy the protector of republican liberty. The struggle of Milan and Cremona against the master of legions forms one of the most heroic pages of secular history. When on May 29, 1176, 'the Company of Death' defeated the great Emperor in the Marathon of Lombardy, the burghers obtained more than their own freedom. The victory of Legnano forced Frederic not only to grant the independence of the Italian cities,¹ but also to make his peace with Alexander, the virtual head of the League, in whose honour they had named their great fortress of Alessandria. Thus by the irony of fate the Emperor who had undertaken to restore the boundaries of the realm of Charles was the first to definitely renounce the imperial claims, and admit the Pope as the independent ruler of the States of the Church. Alexander returned to Rome, entering the city in splendid

¹ At the treaty of Venice (1177) envoys of free cities appeared for the first time beside Emperor and Pope. Treaty with the cities confirmed at Constance, 1183. See Döberl, § 47 and 51.

triumph after his ten years of exile. At his command the king of the English had submitted to be scourged by monks at the grave of the murdered Becket, while the mightiest prince of the time had prostrated himself in the porch of St. Mark's at Venice, kissed the Pope's feet, and acknowledged a priest as the conqueror of Cæsar. But his greatest triumph was his freeing Lombardy and Tuscany from the chains which bound them to the Empire. By this the Papacy made possible the rise of the city republics, destined to bestow upon Italy a second immortality. For once sacerdotalism was the pioneer of freedom.

No act of Barbarossa's reign was really more fatal than the one which at the moment seemed his greatest victory. When Frederic married his son to the heiress Constance, he acquired for his house the great Norman kingdom of Naples and Sicily, since the days of Hildebrand the fief and support of the sacred chair. By this act the popes seemed cut off from help in the south, while in the north only the Lombard League stood between them and the vengeance of Germany. The Empire now encompassed the States of the Church like a ring of iron. The Papacy seemed destined to become the tool of its chiefs. But in the words of Bryce, "the Norman kings were more terrible in their death

than in their life." Constance was the Pandora of the Hohenstaufen, whose fatal inheritance was to prove their destruction. To the old struggle for supremacy were added new elements of hatred and dread. The peace between such foes was ever hollow; the long strife could only end in the downfall of one of the rivals. The truce was short. Only his early death prevented Henry from seeking to recover his father's failure, and with Barbarossa's grandson the end came.

By a tragic irony Frederic II., 'the hammer of the Roman Church,' made his first appearance as its nursling and champion. On the death of his father, Henry VI., the Empire plunged into a long conflict between rival claimants, of which the genius of Innocent III. was not slow to seize the opportunity (*infra*, c. 3). The Pope finally secured the election of Otto of Brunswick, whose family had long been the rivals of the Hohenstaufen. But once on the throne, Otto followed in the steps of his predecessors. So Innocent deposed his creature, and called upon his ward to seize the throne that was his by rights. With scarcely an attendant Frederic crossed the Alps, by difficult passes descending on Chur. From the moment of Frederic's arrival at Basel Otto was lost; his power crumbled away of itself; all Germany hailed as her head the grandson

of her hero. By the battle of Bouvines (1214) the last hope of Otto was shattered. He fled to his castle of Würzburg, the outcast of Pope and man. There, three years later, he passed away, kneeling on a carpet, while scullions beat his shoulders with rods. Amid the pauses of the *Miserere* the voice of the abject was heard, 'Strike, strike, spare not the hardened sinner.'

The exact motives of Innocent in thus reuniting the Empire and Sicily are difficult to discern. He relied perhaps upon his genius and fortune to avert the danger; more probably he was led astray by the necessities of the moment. Innocent himself did not live to witness the results of this reversal of his early policy; but his death, and that of the gentle Honorius, was followed by the greatest and last conflict between Papacy and Empire, in its issues disastrous to both.

Let us glance for a moment at the combatants. The contrast is extraordinary. Frederic II. is perhaps the most inscrutable prince who ever wore a crown. In the analysis of his character it is difficult to say which is the more striking, the genius or the contradictions. Warrior, statesman, lawgiver, troubadour, scholar, patron of arts and science, according to Dante the founder of Italian literature, Frederic is certainly in his accomplishments the most marvellous man

in a marvellous age. He stands out before us with no half tones; he is compact of exaggerated light and shade. In his jurisprudence we see the profound legislator, original and lofty beyond his age, the severe guardian of the morals of his subjects, the defender of equal rights and equal burdens, developing commerce and Parliaments by his fostering care. In his life we have the freethinker and libertine, who maintained at Lucera a harem of Saracen concubines, and who regulated his doings by the advice of astrologers like Michael Scot. His religion—we are not speaking of his diplomatic professions of faith—is to this day the debate of historians. In his addresses to Europe we behold a Luther three centuries before his time, holding up to scorn the sins of the Papacy, an ardent admirer of apostolic poverty, distressed above all things that ‘Christian charity is dried up not in its streams, not in its branches, but in its stem.’ He proclaims that ‘he honours the humblest priest as a father,’ and that it is ‘his mission of God to give back to the sheep their shepherd, to the people their bishop, and force him to tread in the holy footsteps of Jesus.’ So he burnt Waldenses, drove out the friars, feasted Muslim and bishops at the same table, scoffed at transubstantiation,—‘how many gods,’ he

sneered, passing through a cornfield, 'might be made out of this wheat,'—and allowed the disciples of Joachim di Fiori (*infra*, p. 203) to hail him in their blasphemous adulations as a new Messiah. We may dismiss the sneers and scandals of his adversaries, but we must acknowledge that by his age generally Frederic was considered, not without cause, to be the enemy of all that it held most sacred. By Saracens regarded for the favour he showed them as almost a Mohammadan, by heretics rightly depicted as the real founder of the papal inquisition, courteous and generous to foes yet the associate in cruelty of the infamous Eccelin da Romano, the friend of Parliaments yet the determined enemy of every form of democracy, beloved as a friend yet a suspicious despot who murdered his most trusted confidant, Peter della Vigna,¹ Frederic is indeed, in the verdict of Matthew of Paris, 'Fredericus stupor Mundi et immutator mirabilis,' Frederic the Wonder of the World. A great emperor like his grandfather he was not, for his genius seems utterly devoid of principle. He persecuted without bigotry, disbelieved without unbelief, was a reformer without conviction, and passed away clad in the white robes of a Cistercian, recon-

¹ Cf. *Hell*, c. xiii. 30-80 ; a remarkable passage.

ciled in his last moments to the Church, and worshipped when dead by crazy enthusiasts.

With Frederic contrast his opponent in the Lateran. If the one is the most dazzling in the long list of imperial failures, the other is perhaps the most astute in a long line of papal successes. Gregory IX., the personal friend of Francis and Dominic, was no ordinary man. Born about the year 1147,¹ older therefore than his kinsman Innocent III., Cardinal Ugolini was nearly eighty when called to the papal throne. But for years before his election he had been the guiding brain of the curia. 'Ugolini,' said Frederic, 'is a man of spotless reputation, of blameless morals, renowned for piety, erudition, and eloquence. He shines among the other cardinals like a brilliant star.' He had been the very soul of the crafty advocates of moderation who by the help of Brother Elias had captured the simple saint of Assisi, and changed an order of apostles into organised watch-dogs of Rome. But great as was the abyss which separated the sublime ideal of Francis from that of the cardinal who loved him, broke his heart, and canonised him, we must beware lest in our sympathy with the saint we do the pontiff a wrong. The aim of the one was the imitation of Christ ;

¹ So Matthew of Paris. But Felten rejects and dates 1170.

of the other the advancement of the Church: Ugolini would have claimed that both sought the glory of God.

But with Francis and Ugolini we shall deal later; our present concern is with the astute Pope, the Justinian to whom Rome owes the codification of her canons, whose eighty years had neither dimmed his vision nor impaired his strength, but rather given "that singular beauty which distinguishes the old who have escaped the usury of life." History tells of few more remarkable triumphs of mind over body than that of Gregory, as for fifteen years the old man, with unclouded brain and unrivalled experience, confronted the great Emperor in the maturity of his powers. Unlike some of his predecessors, he refused to lower his cause by unworthy methods. When Henry rebelled against his father (1235), the Pope was the first to come to Frederic's assistance with stern denunciations of the unnatural crime. To the last he was true to his own ideal: 'neither depressed by calamity nor elated by prosperity.' In the hour of death (1241), when his cause seemed lost, when the forces of Frederic were at the gates of Rome, the old man of ninety-five still hurled out defiance. 'The bark of Peter,' he wrote to the Venetians, 'is for a time tossed by tempests

and dashed against breakers; but soon it shall emerge unexpectedly from the foaming billows and sail in uninjured majesty over the glassy sea.'

The other opponent of Frederic was Innocent iv., the last great pope of the Middle Ages. Though unlike his predecessor in loftiness of character, Innocent was endowed with inflexible determination and consummate ability. But his insatiable avarice estranged even his friends, while his haughty pretensions and shameless nepotism prepared the way for the fall of the Papacy. We may disregard the curses which Frederic hurled at his former friend: 'a hypocrite whose thirst for power all the waters of Jordan could not wash away.' But the judgment of his contemporaries stands out in the daring pages of the great historian of the age. Matthew of Paris tells us that as Innocent lay dying,—wasted, men whispered, by the curses of Grosseteste,—his relatives surrounded his couch: 'Why do you weep,' he asked; 'have I not made you rich enough?' After his death he was dragged away to hell; he had 'made the Church the vilest of slaves,' 'degraded her into a counting-house of money-changers,' and 'shaken her foundation stones of faith, justice, and truth.' Before his election Innocent had been the partisan of Frederic, but

once on the throne he was faithful to the genius of the Papacy. He spoke of the Emperor as 'the great dragon,' of the kings of Europe as 'the little basilisks'; both alike, he said, 'must be trampled under foot.' He succeeded in his schemes, but the price he paid was the destruction of those foundations of esteem upon which the real strength of the Papacy rested.

Such were the combatants. The special pretexts which kindled their strife may be profitably ignored. They are but masks, behind which we see the real cause, the implacable rivalry of the spiritual and civil powers. That the popes were in general the aggressors can hardly be denied; their excuse would have been that by their position this was inevitable. Yet there is something almost grotesque in the way in which they seized upon every opportunity for branding their foe as the enemy of Christianity itself. In a moment of youthful enthusiasm Frederic had promised that he would follow in the steps of his grandfather; his refusal to interrupt the progress of his reforms in Sicily in order to embark on a crusade drew down upon him the wrath of Gregory. We see him excommunicated for not going, then again excommunicated for going,—he had set out 'not as a crusader but as a pirate,'—and lastly

excommunicated for coming back. For over a hundred years crusade after crusade had attempted, with incredible sacrifice, the recovery of Jerusalem, and all except Godfrey of Bouillon had failed. But when Frederic succeeded, and, by clever diplomacy, gained the hope of Europe without losing a soldier, he was once more excommunicated for his very success. A Christian king reigned again in the Holy City (1229), the sepulchre of the Saviour was delivered from the Muslim, but Frederic's easy-going toleration of the infidels gave the Pope an excuse for his curses.

Nine years of hollow peace were followed by the opening once more of the disastrous struggle. Of the intentions of the Emperor there can be no doubt. 'Italy,' he wrote to the Pope, 'is my heritage, as is well known to the whole world'; and to win back the land which had ever been the curse of Germany he declared war on the Lombard League. But besides the free communes fighting for their liberty stood the Papacy, fighting not only for the States of the Church, but for its very independence. For Frederic had followed the example of his father, and stamped on his seals the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul; a claim whose significance the popes could not fail to note.

Of the struggle itself the main details must be sought in Italian history. But they form far more than a part in the endless controversy between Guelf and Ghibelline,¹ whose memories darkened for Dante the circles of eternal light. The results at any rate belong to all time. There are two incidents in the struggle which demand a passing notice. The one is the appeal which both parties made to the public opinion of Europe. In their anxiety to enlist by encyclicals the new force of popular sentiment, both Emperor and Pope remind us at times of modern pamphleteers. But in this war of words the victory rested with the Papacy. The reason for this is instructive. The popes monopolised the channels of popular information. The emperors might issue proclamations whose logic admitted no answer, but they were for the most part locked up in the chancellaries of sovereigns. At the outside they would find their way to the scriptorium of some abbey, or be posted on the doors of the town

¹ The difference between these two famous terms is well given by Emerton, *Med. Europe*, p. 272: "In Italy the term Guelf came to mean the interest of the Papacy, but also and with equal significance the interests of the new industrial civilisation of the cities, while Ghibelline became the party name for the Italian imperialists, and also for that great class of inherited interests which found their best support in the imperial idea as against both Papacy and democracy."

halls—a small advantage this among a people who could not read. But the popes appealed to more than the courts. From every pulpit of Europe their letters were read out to an awe-struck people, to whom their voice was as the voice of God; while the wandering friars, already Rome's most active and indomitable soldiers, scattered their edicts by every roadside, or proclaimed them in the halls of kings. In their conflict with the Papacy the Empire lacked the greatest weapon of the future. The printing-press would have been worth all the mailed warriors of Germany. In a later generation Gutenberg would accomplish the task which baffled the Hohenstaufen. When the printer of Mainz freed the people from dependence upon the pulpit for their information he sapped the foundations of papal strength.

The other incident is equally significant. In the anxiety of both Frederic and the popes to appeal to a General Council we feel the shadow of a coming movement, the full significance of which would be revealed at Constance. But to the conciliar theory Frederic and the popes were alike indifferent; their sole desire was to capture such a gathering for their own purposes. The first move in this game was made by the Emperor. In 1239, Frederic adjured the

cardinals 'by the blood of Jesus Christ, calling upon the judgment of God, that they summon a General Council.' His messengers, however, were seized by the Pope and, as he complained, 'thrust into the foulest prison.' In the following year Gregory determined that he would use the weapon of Frederic, and issued the necessary summons. But a General Council, called and packed by the Pope, was as impossible for Frederic as a General Council summoned and dominated by the Emperor was impossible for Gregory. So Frederic once more despatched a circular letter. He declared that he would not allow such a Council to assemble, and urged his special objection against the English taking part. They were, he said,—a plea which their king (Henry III.) to his shame allowed,—the sworn subjects of the Pope.

The bishops everywhere were between Scylla and Charybdis. If they refused to go, they were liable to deprivation; if they went, Frederic threatened them with his familiar tortures. The most part stayed at home, but a considerable number of French and Spanish prelates, together with a few from England, were persuaded to assemble at Nice, whence the Genoese had undertaken to transport them by sea to Rome. At length they set sail, escorted by thirty-two

armed galleys. On May 3, 1241, they fell in near the isle of Giglio with the imperial fleet. The Genoese were outnumbered, as well as embarrassed by their passengers and baggage. The Spanish bishops escaped, but twenty-two galleys were captured, and the French prelates, 'naked and shoeless,' carried captive to Pisa. They were afterwards imprisoned at Naples, 'heaped together,' says Matthew of Paris, 'like pigs,' and deriving what comfort they could from the letters of Gregory. The dauntless old man praised their devotion, but said not a word about peace with the victor, though conscious that his scheme had failed, and that Frederic was already at his gates.

The idea which Gregory thus failed to accomplish was successfully carried out by his successor. Innocent IV. realised that a Council in Rome was an impossibility; while he lingered in Italy, Pope and Council were alike at the mercy of Frederic. So twelve months after his accession he eluded the vigilance of the Emperor, and escaped by sea to his native Genoa. Secular monarchs seeking elsewhere an asylum forfeit their crown; the popes alone find in exile more abject reverence and greater authority. 'Our soul,' cried Innocent, as he stepped on shore amid the clanging of bells and

the chanting of priests, 'is escaped as a bird the snare of the fowler; the net is broken and we are free.' From Genoa he crossed the Alps and took up his abode in Lyons, in theory still a city of the Empire, in reality already dominated by the neighbouring King of France. Under the protection of Saint Louis, Innocent felt safe in once more summoning a General Council (1245). The servile assembly obeyed his commands, and, after a mockery of a trial, Innocent pronounced Frederic 'excommunicated of God, and deposed from all the dignity of empire.'¹ The Princes of Germany were ordered to proceed forthwith to the election of a new sovereign; while Innocent employed his vast wealth, more especially the revenues he drained from England, in enlisting soldiers for his crusade against Frederic, whom he branded as 'the enemy of the Crucified.' But in spite of all the preaching of the friars, the sedition of the powerful German ecclesiastics, and the efforts of Innocent to raise up a rival to the throne, in spite even of the ceaseless resistance of the

¹ Grosseteste was present and signed the decree. His famous memorandum on the evils of the Church (given in all the histories) was delivered to the Curia at Lyons on a second visit in 1250. For Grosseteste's relations with Innocent the student should read Stevenson's *Grosseteste*, cc. 11, 13, and 14.

great Guelf cities of Lombardy, for two years the star of Frederic was still in the ascendant. But in 1248 there befell the sudden and awful reverse before Parma. Disaster followed disaster, until the end came. On December 19, 1250, 'the Wonder of the World' passed away, his spirit broken, his genius wasted, his favourite son a captive, his foes triumphant.

III

With the fall of Frederic fell the Empire. 'From this time forward,' writes Capgrave, 'our annotation shall be after the reign of the kings of England, for the Empire in a manner ceased here.' The kingdom of Frederic in Sicily was given to a stranger; his empire ignominiously sold to a wealthy Englishman (Richard of Cornwall), and Conradin, his grandson, the last of his family, beheaded at Naples on a public scaffold (1268). For two-and-twenty years after his death Germany lacked a head. The popes by their victory had not only cut Italy off from the Empire,—a loss this that might well have proved its greatest blessing,—they had destroyed the very foundations of German stability. Anarchy became triumphant, and the forces of anarchy played too surely into the hands of the Papacy for the popes to be anxious

to end the interregnum. At length, after years of misery, Gregory x. found it expedient to procure once more the election of an emperor. The step was not due to either repentance or remorse. The papal revenues were suffering through the tyranny of the barons and their endless strife. So to benefit their purse the Papacy restored in Rudolf of Hapsburg the central authority it had destroyed (1273). But the new emperors possessed only the name of the past. They were too occupied in coping with turbulence at home to dream of once more trying issues with the Holy Chair. Dante might still dream that the complete independence and harmonious co-operation of Empire and Papacy was God's providential plan and purpose for the well-being of the world; but Dante's *De Monarchia* is really an epitaph, not a prophecy;¹ while his great poem has been rightly called "the trumpet which summoned the Middle Ages

¹ Dante is indispensable to the student. There is scarcely an event of the thirteenth century which he does not touch. For his conceptions of Empire and Papacy, see Bryce, pp. 256, 265-269, and Moore, *Studies in Dante*, 2nd Series (the 1st is technical only), especially pp. 13-34. Also valuable essay by Mazzini, *The Minor Works of Dante*. Note that Dante places Anastasius (? II.) in hell for heresy, four contemporary popes for simony; in purgatory, Adrian v. for avarice, Martin iv. for gluttony; while his condemnation of Celestine v. reverses a decree of canonisation.

into the modern world." Between its lines we may read the death-sentence of the old feudalism. For the Hapsburgs were but the shadows of the mighty Hohenstaufen. They might blazon on their plate and buildings the famous device, A.E.I.O.U.,—*Austriæ est imperare orbi universo*,—but in reality they were rather the superstitious lackeys than the dreaded rivals of Rome. With rare exceptions they were only bold when executing her will. So completely, in fact, were matters reversed that in the later centuries the Papacy found her chief support in the heirs of her former foes. But to call the sovereigns of Vienna the heirs of the great Swabians is but an historical and legal fiction. The most venerable political institution of the world, the only rival of the Papacy, had sunk into a ridiculous piece of antiquarianism, about which all that could be said was the sneer of Voltaire, that it was "neither Holy nor Roman nor an Empire."

The review of the conflict brings into prominence certain points worthy of note. In the first place, the reader will mark that whereas the attempts of the emperors to destroy their rivals by a schism ended in failure, the efforts of the Papacy to foment civil war in the Empire always succeeded. The reason is instructive.

An anti-pope under the protection of the Emperor was felt by Europe to be an impossibility. The same cause which at a later date made the nations rebel against the French popes at Avignon, made them side against a German pope at Rome. The claims of the Papacy could only be allowed so long as men imagined that the chair of Peter was an independent tribunal. But, on the other hand, all Europe was interested in the weakening of the Empire; others besides the turbulent aristocracy of Germany rejoiced in the opportunities of plunder which civil dissension provided. So streams of gold flowed into the coffers of the Lateran when Gregory IX. proclaimed his crusade against Frederic II.; but when the Emperor, on the death of his aged enemy, for two years kept the Holy See vacant, all Europe cried out that the Church must have a head. So great was the discontent that Frederic was forced to urge the cardinals to elect a successor; while the violence of his language shows his desire to shift the blame on to other shoulders. 'Sons of Belial,' he wrote to the College, 'animals without heads. . . . Birds fly not without a leader, bees live not without a king, yet you abandon the bark of the Church to the waves without a pilot.' But

when the new 'pilot,' Innocent IV., deposed his enemy at the Council of Lyons, the kings of Europe refused to listen to the passionate appeals of Frederic that they would make his cause their own. They were wise; they knew that by his defeat they were winning their own battle. They were foolish; in so far as they failed to foresee the heritage of trouble they were laying up for themselves. In later centuries two great forces have destroyed in different ways the dominance of Rome, the monarchic and democratic. But the monarchic or national was not as yet fully conscious of itself, while the democratic or burgher, at any rate in Italy, was on the side of the Papacy.

But the great weakness of the Empire lay in the cast-iron conservatism of its main idea. The Hohenstaufen consecrated their powers to the vain effort to re-erect ruins. They mistook a dead past for a living present. Their conception of the Empire was a splendid dream, but its fatal defect was its inability to adapt itself to changing conditions. Like the laws of the Medes and Persians it could not alter; so like the laws of the Medes and Persians it paid the death penalty ever exacted from stagnation. When Frederic I. set off on his famous crusade he sent a challenge to Saladin, in its self-deception

the most remarkable ultimatum ever delivered. 'Dost thou not know,' he wrote, 'that both the Ethiopias, Mauritania, Persia, Syria, Parthia, *where Crassus our dictator succumbed to destiny*, that Judea and Samaria, Arabia, and other lands without number, are subject to our rule?' Ridiculous as these claims may seem when judged by fact, they are even more painful as evidence of the disease which was eating out the life of the Empire. The imperial inflexibility which mistook 'Crassus our dictator' for a German duke, which drove the burghers into the arms of Rome by its insistence upon a vanished Cæsarism, which burnt heretics who would have supported the Ghibelline cause, was no match for the marvellous power whereby the Papacy adapted itself to use for its own ends the forces of the day, the republicanism of Milan, or the enthusiasm of crusader or friar. The popes were no less tenacious of the past than the emperors, but theirs was the living conservatism which renews its strength by assimilating new life. The history of Germany is the history of an arrested development; its curse the iron bands of dead ideals.

The results of the struggle were disastrous alike for the Empire and the Papacy. Hitherto Germany had been the most stable and united

realm in Europe, that too at a time when the other kingdoms were fluid and inchoate. Her history henceforth is drift and deterioration, until at length, in the famous phrase of Bryce, Charles IV., by his Golden Bull, "legalised anarchy and called it a constitution." The Fatherland had become the "monster with the hundred heads" so familiar to students of modern history. The long centuries of German hopelessness, the misery of its inhabitants as they lay at the mercy of innumerable lordlings, the slow growth of its literature and art, the utter absence of a national system of law¹—these are the crimes which must be laid at the door of Roman ambition, for they are the direct outcome of the overthrow by the Papacy of all central authority.

Not less disastrous in the long run were the results for the Papacy itself. The real foe both of the Papacy and the Empire was the growing spirit of nationalism. So long as the Empire existed, nationalism, as we have seen, hesitated to attack the Papacy. But with the fall of Frederic, Rome was left face to face with her new and greater foe. The overthrow of the Papacy under Boniface, following with overwhelming suddenness the days of her strength

¹ On this see Fisher, *op. cit.* vol. i. c. 4.

and glory, has sometimes excited remark. In reality Rome had fallen half a century before. Her victory over the Hohenstaufen was her most terrible disaster. For the strength of Empire and Papacy lay in a common centripetal and universal idea, whose hold upon the thought of Europe was not the less profound because indefinite and illogical. By the destruction of her rival, Rome had undermined her own foundations. The central idea of the solidarity of Europe upon which she rested for her strength was shattered, and the new nationalism stepped into the vacant place. While the popes had been busy reducing the Empire to a shadow, the Capets from ciphers had become realities, and England a consolidated monarchy. The fall of the Papacy under the control of France was the nemesis of History for her destruction of the Empire; for from the fatal days of Avignon the Papacy has never recovered.

Even in Germany the thunderbolts hurled by the Roman Church were destined to lodge in her own heart. To the people of Germany—we make a distinction between the people and the rulers, for the rulers, through various causes, were often papal in their sympathies—the popes were henceforth the object of a hatred whose strength lay in the darkness of their anarchy

and the imaginary glories of their past. Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the cities of the Rhine were seething with undercurrents of rebellion. With the coming of Luther the fountains of the great deep were opened. Then perhaps the eyes of the Papacy were unsealed. The Empire they had destroyed would have destroyed the Reformation; the great centralised government of the Frederics or the Ottos would have made short work of its assertions of freedom and individualism. But the Empire was gone; Charles v. was but a shadow without substance or power. Like all the Hapsburgs, he had the will, but lacked the central authority whereby he might crush the monk of Wittenberg, or restrain the enthusiasm of the people. Thus the triumph of Luther would have been impossible had not the blind ambition of the Innocents and Gregories prepared the way by sweeping aside the hated Empire. They were, in fact, in the providence of God, the messengers sent before his face. They worked, as they thought, for their own ends; they knew not that they were making straight in the wilderness the pathway of wider hopes and a more spiritual faith.

CHAPTER II

MOHAMMAD OR CHRIST

Careless seems the great Avenger ; . . .

*Truth for ever on the scaffold, Wrong for ever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim
unknown*

*Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His
own.*

AUTHORITIES.—§ 1. MUIR, *The Life of Mahomet* and his *The Caliphate* (uninteresting, founded on WEIL). WELLHAUSEN in *Encyc. Brit.*, and the short summary of Islam in GEDEN, *Comparative Religion*.

§ 2. BARLOW, *The Normans in South Italy*. OMAN, *Byzantine Empire* (useful sketch). F. HARRISON, *Meaning of History*, cc. 11 and 12 (excellent study of Constantinople's importance). FINLAY, *Hist. Greece*, ii.-iv., or BURY's *Later Roman Empire* (new ed. in preparation).

§ 3. The story of Crusades yet to be written in English. For analysis of materials, see BURY, *Gibbon*, vi. App. I. For general account, GIBBON (Ed. BURY, with notes by LANE-POOLE) still best. MILLS, MICHAUD, etc., best left alone. ARCHER and KINGSFORD, *Crusades*, good so far as it goes. LUDLOW, *The Age of Crusades* (moderate only). CONDER, *The Latin Kingdom of J.* (uninteresting through crowd of details). BESANT and PALMER, *Jerusalem*. H. v. SYBEL, *Hist. and Lit. of Crusades* (still useful). Of special monographs, note STUEBS, *Chronicles R. I.* (Rolls'), with valuable introduction. The 2nd Crusade in MORISON, *St. Bernard*; PEARS, *The Fourth Crusade and the Fall of Constantinople*; LANE-POOLE, *Saladin*; DAVIS, *St. Louis and the Invasion of Egypt* (1249); and for military matters, OMAN, *Art of War in the Middle Ages*, Book v. (interesting).

§ 4. WATTS' *Spain*; LANE-POOLE, *Moors in Spain*; MEAKIN, *The Moorish Empire*; and, of course, the great work of HODGKIN, for the Visigothic kingdom, and for position of Venice.

MOHAMMAD OR CHRIST

I

IN the former volume (c. 2) we traced the victories of the Cross over the heathen of Europe. We saw how Rome, hemmed in on the North by hordes of savages, and pressed in the East and West by the Muslim, set before herself the conquest of a new spiritual empire in place of the one she had lost. We marked how the rivalry of the Celtic Church ministered to her growth; the ripe fruit that others should have reaped fell into her hands. From Iceland to Hungary the soldiers of the Lateran carried all before them. Saxons, Frisians, Swedes, Finns, Huns, the dwellers in Germany and the rovers of the sea, became alike the subjects of the new empire of Rome.

The struggle of Latin Christianity with the Muslim was more prolonged, and its issue, alas! far different. Secular writers, as a rule, have treated the Crusades as an isolated and curious episode in the life of the nations. Their mistake

has arisen from a restricted outlook, and, in special, from the tendency of English historians to narrow down their horizon to the study of national development on its political side. No doubt also the social and economic results of the Crusades were less in England than on the Continent. So the student, intent on the growth of his institutions of freedom, fails to realise the essential oneness of the movement for the conquest of the East with that which in an earlier age freed his land from the worship of Woden, or led Boniface and Anskar to be the Apostles of the North. He accordingly dismisses the Crusades as an interesting but useless break in the story of the slow growth of his liberties, or at most points out the secondary results of this central drama of the medieval world—increased commerce, culture, civilisation, the growth of medicine, philosophy, and art, the downfall of feudalism and ignorance. But let the reader whose conception of the Crusades is thus restricted, take a map of the world, let him accurately colour thereon the extent of Mohammadan conquest, let him remember the depth and power of Arab civilisation and its former hold upon the intellect and sentiment of the West, and the contrast with the present will show him that the Crusades are no impulsive

uncorrelated episode, but form part of the struggle of centuries between the Crescent and the Cross, the end of which is not yet.

With the life of Mohammad and the causes of his conquest of Eastern Christianity we purpose dealing elsewhere, but it is important that the reader should remember that when Gregory the Great was dying at Rome, Mohammad (b. 570) had not yet begun to proclaim his call. He was still brooding in the cave of Hira; only in the following year did he attempt the conversion of his wife and kin (610). The greatness of Gregory, as we have seen, lay in his inauguration at the psychological moment of a new era; he definitely launched the Latin Church on a career of aggression (i. c. 2). By so doing he saved Christianity. Only the new enthusiasm of the new converts could have resisted the onset of the Unitarians. But Gregory was not more far-seeing than his fellows; he only tried to do his duty. He died in ignorance of the prophet of Mecca, and of the issues depending on his own forward policy.

The missions begun by Gregory started with every prospect of meeting but such opposition as might be expected from the intolerance of heathenism or the rivalry of the Irish. The fields were white unto harvest; the hopes of the

Church seemed limitless. But within a few years all was changed. Christianity was assailed along its whole frontier. Regions in which for centuries the gospel had been supreme were lost to the Cross; and the first centres of Christianity were swallowed up in the vortex of Islam. In the East the ruin was complete. Christian indifference and discord were no match for the new fanaticism. "The sword," cried Mohammad, "is the key of heaven and of hell; a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer; whosoever falls in battle his sins are forgiven, at the last day his wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion and odoriferous as musk." "Remember," said the Caliph, Abu Bekr, to his Syrian army, "that you are always in the presence of God, on the verge of death, in the assurance of judgment, and the hope of Paradise. When therefore you fight the battles of the Lord, quit you like men." At the siege of Damascus, Khalid, *the Sword of God*, was urged to rest. "O Derar," he replied, as he mounted a fresh horse, "we shall rest in the world to come; he that labours to-day shall rest to-morrow." When Mohammad proclaimed war on the Emperor Heraclius, some of the more timid, who had not yet discerned so clearly as

their leader the splendid weakness of the Romans, pleaded the intolerable heat: "Hell is much hotter," cried the indignant Prophet, as he excommunicated the cowards. "Paradise is before you, the Devil and hell fire in your rear," echoed his generals at the fatal battle of the Yermuk (634).

Such promises and threats cried havoc and let slip the dogs of war. Religion became an intrepid fanaticism; a heaven of black-eyed houris the reward of carnage. Before his death Mohammad had seen the conquest of Arabia; under his immediate successors Arabia threatened to overwhelm the world. In the ten years of the reign of Omar, the Saracens conquered thirty-six thousand cities and castles, and destroyed four thousand churches. 'The Arabs dwell,' sings one of their poets, 'beneath the shadow of their lances; they cook their food upon the ashes of conquered towns.' Within a few years their zeal had crushed Persia (633-642) and overthrown the religion of Zoroaster. In the North, Khalid swept all before him, captured Damascus, Jerusalem, and Antioch, and drove back Heraclius and his veterans in flight to Constantinople (636?)¹ In the West, Amr (Amrou), by the help of the Coptic Christians, overran Egypt, turned Memphis the city of

¹ For chronology, see *Bury, Gibbon, v. App. 21.*

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 9612
D. D. No. 270.3

ancient Pharaohs into a solitude, and captured Alexandria, the first city of the world for trade, the second in population.¹

The ambition or selfishness of Rome might possibly view with indifference the fall of the three ancient patriarchates that had so often disputed her pre-eminence and opposed her claims. But when Okba swept Africa from the Nile to the ocean (669–683), while Hasan delivered Carthage to the flames (698), she realised the danger at her own doors. “Great God,” cried Okba, as he spurred his horse into the Atlantic, “if my course were not stopped by this sea I would go on to the unknown kingdoms of the West, preaching the unity of Thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other God than Thee.” The ocean was impassable, so the Saracens turned aside into Spain, intent like Hannibal on the conquest of Europe and Rome from the West. By the fatal victory of Salado (Guadalete) (711), the Gothic monarchy was ruined; Roderic, the last ignoble successor of Alaric, perished in his flight;

¹ Oct. 17, 641. For the myth of the destruction of its library, see Bury's *Gibbon*, v. p. 454. Cairo (Fustat), *the town of victory*, was built out of the ruins of Memphis. For the doubtful story of Okba, see Meakin, *Moorish Empire*, p. 23, n., who reminds us that Spain was conquered by Berbers, not Arabs.

and Spain, which had resisted for two hundred years the arms of the Romans, yielded herself in a few months to the victorious Saracens. Only in the valleys of the Pyrenees and amid the mountains of the Asturias could a remnant of the Goths maintain their faith and freedom, and under the leadership of Pelayo (d. 737) repulse the forces of Islam, and lay the foundation of the future kingdoms of Spain.

By the end of the first century after the Hegira¹ the empire of the caliphs was the greatest empire on the face of the earth. They reigned by the right of conquest from the Atlantic to the Indus; in the West, they threatened to descend the Alps, and conquer the Eternal City; in the East, Constantinople had already suffered two sieges at their hands.² Mohammad had declared war on the human race, and the human race and the Christian religion seemed destined to be crushed by his sword. The world *must make peace*³ with the stronger, they must surrender to Allah. "Ye Christian dogs," cried Khalid, "ye know your

¹ The Hegira, or Flight of Mohammad, from Mecca to Medina, took place Sept. 20, 622. But the Arabs date from July 16.

² 1st, 674-676; 2nd, 716-718.

³ *Islam* and *Muslim* are the infinitive and participle of the causative form of the verb *slm*, which connotes peace.

option, the Quran, the tribute, or the sword." All along the coast of Africa, where once five hundred sees had gloried in the faith of Augustine and Cyprian, the light of the gospel was totally extinguished. Church bells rang no more; in the early dawn, instead of the chanting of priests, the cry of the muedddhin rose in the sleeping cities.

God is most great, God is most great,
I testify there is no God but Allah.
I testify Mohammad is God's messenger,
Come ye and pray, come ye and pray;
For prayer is better than sleep,
There is no God but Allah.

In Spain,¹ though toleration and half the churches had been granted to the Christians, the six hundred mosques in the royal city of Cordova proclaimed the dominant religion.

II

In 718 the Arabs crossed the Pyrenees; and in successive swarms spread over the southern

¹ For an excellent study of the causes of the conquest of Spain, see *English Historical Review*, vol. ii., *Visigothic Spain*. There Dr. Hodgkin shows that the Church Council had practically drawn to itself the whole power of the State, and was chiefly intent on uprooting Judaism. "Shem was to take a fearful revenge. True, the revenge came not from the race of Isaac, but from their kinsmen of the desert. But there can

regions of France. But Abd-ar-rahman, their general, was not satisfied with these narrow limits. In 731 he invested Arles, and overspread Burgundy as far as Lyons and Besançon, slaughtering the Christians by thousands, and delivering their churches to the flames. In further campaigns he would carry the Quran to the Northern Ocean, and teach its doctrines to the dwellers in Ultima Thule. But in a seven days' fight between Tours and Poitiers, which changed the history of the world (October 732), Charles the Hammer (Martel) and his Germans drove the nations of Africa and Asia before him in headlong flight, and wrested France from their grasp. The Christianity of Europe was saved; never again would the caliphs have such an opportunity. The victors had been vanquished by the splendour and luxury of their conquests; their great empire was falling to pieces by its sheer weight. Unity was lost in a loose confederation; fanaticism extinguished in the greater hatred of contending dynasties, and the bitter schism, which has rent Islam to this day, of Sunnee and Shiah.

In the West the Saracen attacks were hence-

be no doubt that the rapid success of the Saracens was due in part at least to their secret understanding with the Jews. The soil was mined under the feet of its Gothic lords."

forth rather the raids of pirates than the organised and far-reaching schemes of the early caliphs. Nevertheless, the light corsairs of the Saracens swept the Mediterranean, reduced Palermo (831), and gradually conquered the whole of Sicily (827–878). Throughout the island Christianity was almost uprooted. In 846 the Arab fleets entered the Tiber and sacked the churches, destroying the sepulchre of St. Paul, and breaking up the huge bronze coffin in which, according to universal belief, lay the mortal remains of St. Peter. A more formidable attack in 849 would have established their power in the heart of the Christian world, had not the vigilance of Pope Leo IV. formed an alliance of the maritime republics of Gaieta, Naples, and Amalfi. By the naval battle of Ostia and the storm which completed the work of destruction, Rome was delivered from their dread. The Papacy was saved; but the freedom of Italy was yet to be wrought. The Greeks, the Franks, and the Lombards contended together for the mastery, while Saracen fleets put out annually from Palermo and ravaged impartially the territories of all.

In the ninth and tenth centuries the deplorable weakness of the Empire and Papacy provided no leadership, and the future of Christianity in Italy was still uncertain. But

with the eleventh century all was changed. The seething of the barbarians was over; Europe had passed through its Medean caldron, and had risen from its agony with new life in its veins. The nations of the North were now to pay back to the South the debt they owed for the missionary toils which had won them to Christ. The Normans, the Arabs of the seas, had turned aside from their worship of Woden, and become the foremost champions of the Cross. Their new zeal would consecrate to higher service their old love of adventure and booty. In 1016, as a Saracen fleet was besieging Salerno, it happened that forty Norman knights returning from a pilgrimage to Palestine disembarked in the neighbourhood. Hearing of the peril of the town at Paynim hands, they hastened to its relief. They returned to Normandy laden with the rich presents of its grateful prince. The news of their adventure and its reward set Normandy on fire. Successive swarms of knight-errants crossed the Alps, delivered Italy from the infidels, drove out the Greeks, subdued the Lombards, broke the heart of Leo IX. by Robert Wiscard's defeat of the papal forces at Civitate (1059), and were then by the daring genius of Hildebrand enrolled as defenders of the Papacy, and invested 'by the grace of God and

St. Peter' with Southern Italy and 'hereafter of Sicily.' To obtain this heritage, Roger, the twelfth son of Tancred of Hauteville, and the younger brother of Wiscard, landed at Messina (1060), at the head of sixty soldiers, and after a struggle of thirty years won that island from the Muslim.

Italy and France were now free. The West was full of new life and enthusiasm. The days of anarchy had given place to the conception of the solidarity of Europe in a Holy Roman Empire under the leadership of the Pope. In France cottage and castle were ringing with Turpin's crusading romance of Charles the Great and his nephew Roland—how they conquered the Holy Land and smote the Paynim. The song became a call; the legend the hope of the future. Every noble of Normandy dreamed of carving out for himself like Wiscard a new kingdom at the expense of the Saracens; while the passions of the people were roused as they heard how mad Hakem, the Sultan of Egypt, had razed to the ground the sacred sepulchre, and imposed a tax of a gold piece on every worshipper (1010). Chivalry, too, was giving a religious sanction and aim to the old spirit of the berserker. In Tancred and Godfrey we behold not only "the perfect gentle knight," celebrated alike in history and romance, but the soldier who adds a

higher dignity to arms by wielding them in the cause of faith. In the paralysis of imperial energy, feudalism, with its host of petty sovereigns and its close interdependence of lord and vassal, supplied the necessary social conditions, untrammelled by the hesitancy of Parliaments or the conflicting policies of national chancellaries.

To the clear vision of Hildebrand it was evident that the time had come to carry the war into the enemy's camp. His scheme was vast in its outline, characteristic in its grasp of the desires of the age. The Saracens had won by their unity of faith and command; Europe had been lost by its divisions. Hildebrand saw that not by the isolated efforts of freebooters would the Arabs be driven back from their conquests. Unity under one Commander of the Faithful must be met by unity under one Vicar of God, enthusiasm by enthusiasm, the Holy War of the Crescent by the Holy War of the Cross. The great Pope had not himself the opportunity of putting his plans into execution; he bequeathed them along with his other ideas to his successors.¹ By them they were carried out in a tentative

¹ In claiming for Hildebrand the real inauguration of the Crusades I do not overlook the remarkable letter of Sylvester II. See Gerberti, *Epistolae*, ed. Havet, 219. But Gerbert was too discredited (i. 204) to be a force. See also i. 119, n.

and imperfect manner. Urban left out "those great ideas of military method and politico-ecclesiastical conquest upon which Gregory had impressed the stamp of his character" (Sybel).

In 1093 Europe was startled by the news of the fall of Jerusalem to the Seljuk Turks, after incredible slaughter not only of the Christians but also of its former Arab masters. All the privileges hitherto granted to the Christian pilgrims by the policy or humanity of the Saracens were at once withdrawn by the savage Tartars, whose zeal discovered sufficient reasons for cruelty and plunder in the more intolerant passages of the Quran. But pilgrimage had become part of the very life of the Church. The religious fervour of Europe had restlessly turned towards the East;¹ no longer a palmer here and there, but great bands organising their pilgrimages together. 'About 1050,' writes Ralph Glaber in his Chronicle, 'there began to flow towards the Holy Sepulchre so great a multitude as ere this no man could have hoped for. First of all went the meaner folk, then

¹ The student should notice the effect of this on the city of Rome itself, hitherto (i. 42, 43) the great centre of pilgrimages, henceforth deserted. When, in 1190, Richard of England landed at Ostia on his way to Palestine, he actually refused to enter Rome—a change since the pilgrimage of Cnut. But the end of the Crusades and the Jubilee restored matters.

men of middle rank, and lastly very many kings and counts, marquises and bishops, ay, and a thing that had never happened before, many women bent their steps in the same direction.' But every palmer returned from the East to add fuel to the smouldering fire. He told of the crowds of starving pilgrims who had survived the perils of the journey to find themselves locked outside the gates by the Turks until some wealthy bishop or courteous knight should, of his charity, satisfy the rapacity of the conquerors. Happy also the pilgrim who, when he had laid his head on the stone of the Tomb where sins were forgiven, could escape from Jerusalem in peace, not held to ransom for some pretended insult to the Prophet and his faith. Christendom was seething with the sense of its wrongs; the pent-up passions of centuries were waiting an outlet. As is usually the case when all things are ripe for an explosion, an obscure event became the apparent cause. By the preaching of Peter the Hermit, "a nerve was touched of exquisite feeling, and the sensation vibrated to the heart of Europe." In the vigorous language of the Greek Princess Anna Comnena, 'Europe was loosened from its foundations and hurled against Asia.'

In the East also events had ripened towards

the same harvest. The Englishman even of liberal culture is strangely ignorant of the fortunes of the great Empire that continued for centuries at Constantinople the name and authority of Rome. Led astray by the unjust verdict of Gibbon, he regards its annals "as a tedious and uniform tale of weakness and misery," its subjects as slaves in whom we find "a dead uniformity of abject vices, neither softened by the weakness of humanity nor animated by the vigour of memorable crimes." He therefore fails to realise the tremendous debt which the common Christianity of Europe owes to the East. Charles Martel saved the West at Tours; his efforts would have been fruitless had not Constantinople presented an impregnable barrier to all attacks from the side of Asia. The first shock of Muslim conquest found her unprepared, but under the great Emperor Leo the Syrian,¹ and his son Constantine v. (717-775), she recovered her strength. The crusade of Leo against the 'eikons' was only part of his general programme for infusing new life into the realm, driving back the Saracens, and recovering the lost provinces of the Cross. But Leo was before his age alike in his desire for a more primitive Christianity, in his aboli-

¹ Commonly but erroneously called the Isaurian.

tion of serfdom, and his efforts to develop a strong yeomanry by a reform of the land laws. The evils sanctified by time could not be corrected even by his master-hand. After a long struggle iconoclasm¹ failed, and the images were restored, chiefly through the agency of female sovereigns; but the consolidation which had been the work of the great iconoclasts produced its result in large acquisitions by the Basilian dynasty (867–1057) of lost territories both in Asia and Europe.

With the closing years of the eleventh century, it became evident that the power of the Empire was exhausted. Long centuries of pernicious land laws had sapped her vitality. The provinces

¹ For Iconoclasm, see vol. i. 2, 19, and add to the references there given the study of the land-question, Bury, *l.c.* v. App. 12. For the work of the Greeks in the salvation of Europe, compare the eloquent words of the great statesman who through life loved their nation and pleaded their cause:—

“It was those nations who broke the force of the advancing deluge, and left of the deluge only so much as the rest of Europe was able to repel. They were like a shelving beach which restrained the ocean. That beach, it is true, is beaten by the waves, it is laid desolate, it produces nothing; it becomes nothing, perhaps, but a mass of shingle, of rock, of almost useless seaweed; but it is a fence behind which the cultivated earth can spread, and escape the incoming tide; and so it was against the Turk—the resistance of Bulgarians, of Servians, of Greeks, a resistance in which one by one they succumbed” (Gladstone).

of Asia Minor consisted almost entirely of vast domains under absentee lords at Constantinople, or belonged to ecclesiastical corporations exempt from military burdens. Even the magnificence of Constantinople could not have hidden from a medieval Goldsmith the dangers that arise

Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Her strength had been eaten out by that blind selfishness with which in every age God punishes the mammon of unrighteousness. But the Greek Empire had not fallen until her mission was accomplished; she had saved Europe in the hour of her weakness, not so much by her energy as by her impregnable inertia. Eastern Christianity had kept the Muslim at bay while missionaries from Armagh and Canterbury slowly subdued the savage North, and welded its might into one great Christian commonwealth under one leader of the faithful at Rome.

In the ninth and tenth centuries Constantinople had been assisted in her resistance by the strife of her foe. Islam was no longer one within herself; there were rival caliphates of East and West, just as there were two Roman empires with their rival heads. But with the rise of the Seljuk Turks, and their seizure of the supreme power, the defence of discord in the

Mohammadan world became no more. After the strife of centuries, Egypt and Syria had again united under one lord. Constantinople woke up to her danger and weakness. In a hasty moment Alexius Comnenus, putting aside the hatred engendered by the schism and the pride with which his predecessors had treated the usurpers in the West, besought aid of Urban II. The Pope responded to his demand, and first at Piacenza, and afterwards at Clermont (1095), moved the vast crowd into a fury of enthusiasm. 'Exterminate,' he cried, 'this vile race from the land ruled by our brethren. . . . It is Christ who commands. If any lose their lives by land or sea, or in fighting against the heathen, in that hour their sins shall be remitted.¹ Let those who have hitherto been robbers now become soldiers. Let those who have formerly been mercenaries at low wages now gain eternal rewards. Depart assured of the imperishable glory which awaits you in the kingdom of heaven.' 'Diex lo volt,' cried the multitude in its enthusiasm. 'Deus vult,' replied the pontiff, 'let that be your watch-word,' as he handed the strips of red cloth to

¹ Compare the similar promises of Mohammad, p. 50. But Islam has in it no elements of progress; Christianity has grown out of the motives of its childhood.

the thousands who hastened to receive the cross at his hands. Little did Alexius dream of the vast results of his request. Like the Oriental shepherd of whom Gibbon tells, "he had prayed for water; the Ganges was turned into his grounds." Writes Guibert in his Chronicle, 'Although the French alone had heard the preaching of the Crusades, what Christian people did not supply soldiers as well? . . . You might have seen the Scotch covered with shaggy cloaks hasten from the heart of their marshes. . . . I take God to witness there landed in our ports barbarians from nations I wist not of; no one understood their tongues, but, placing their fingers in the form of a cross, they made signs that they desired to proceed to the defence of the Christian faith.'

III

The story of the Crusades (*see* Appendix A) forms no part of our plan. Their details should be read elsewhere. Our sole concern must be with the part they played in the development of the life and organisation of the Church.

That the Crusades failed, no historian will deny. The causes of this failure can be easily discerned. First of all we may put the lack of sea - power, especially in the early

Crusades. The long march overland from Germany or France through the forests of Hungary and the Eastern Empire, then across the deserts and mountains of Asia Minor, would have tried the ability of Alexander or Napoleon at the head of their seasoned legions. It was equally fatal to the martial hosts of Godfrey of Bouillon and to the undisciplined thousands of libertines, criminals, and pilgrims who followed the standard of Walter the Penniless. In the field, as at Dorylæum (1097), the Crusaders were irresistible. Entangled in the passes of Cilicia or wandering in waterless deserts, their very strength became their ruin. 'God alone knows,' writes an old chronicler, 'the number of the martyrs whose blood flowed beneath the blades of the Turks and under the sword of the Greeks.' But the greater part were not privileged to fall by the sword.¹

The lack of sea-power, the possession of which would have led to complete success, was the effect of a still deeper cause. Christendom possessed sea-power in abundance, but in the Mediterranean at least sea-power was at this time

¹ The numbers destroyed have been variously estimated. Gibbon computes that at least 300,000 perished in the preliminary expedition of Walter the Penniless. The total loss of the Crusades was at least 2,000,000.

either in the hands of the Greeks ¹ or of the cities of Italy—Venice, Genoa, and Pisa. From the first the sea-power of the Greeks was denied to the West. Of the others, Venice was the ally and the hired guardian of Constantinople; while all three were rather intent on the fostering of their commerce with the East, or in gaining an advantage in their constant quarrels with each other. In the Middle Ages, the great commercial cities were not noted for their religious zeal. The interests of trade could not be put in hazard even for the welfare of Christendom. They would only sell themselves to the service of God if the pay was adequate. Unfortunately, enthusiasm is as a rule penniless. But the real secret of failure lay in the hostility of the Eastern and Western empires, and the still deeper hatred of the Greek and Latin Churches. If Christendom had flung itself with all its strength upon the Paynim, its forces would have been invincible; it recoiled, broken and dispirited, more by its own divisions than by any irresistible barrier. The Church failed to win

¹ For the sea-power of the Greeks, see Bury's *Gibbon*, vi. App. 5. For the relation of Venice to the Empire, *ibid.* p. 381, n. Oman, *op. cit.* 235, points out the fatal ignorance of geography, the crowning disaster of which was Louis IX.'s invasion of Egypt and defeat at Mansourah (1250).

back the conquests of the Unitarians because it was a house as bitterly divided against itself in the thirteenth century as in the nineteenth ; only in the thirteenth century the division was between two great Churches corresponding to two great Empires—Church and Empire alike claiming to be sole and original—whereas in the nineteenth century the fissures are more numerous, and the divisions national rather than religious. But the results of the divisions of Christendom have always been the same. They are written in the first conquests of the Saracens and in the fruitless efforts of the Crusades. We see them marked in the after victories of the Turks. They culminate in that crime of crimes when Europe allowed Constantinople herself, for centuries the second capital of the world and the bulwark of Christianity, to fall into their hands. To this also must be put the later list of tragedies in Hungary, Servia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Greece, the shameful servitude of Crete and the isles of the *Ægean*, the cruelty and tyranny of the rovers of Salli,¹ and the disgraceful coquetings of England herself with the enemy of human progress. When in generations yet to come the completed story shall be told of

¹ For an excellent account of this shocking chapter of history, see Meakin, *Moorish Empire*, cc. 13, 14.

the Church of the Redeemer, not the saddest page will be the record of the selfishness and blindness which in former ages marked its dealings with the great foe of civilisation and faith.

But we are anticipating. The hatred of East and West manifested itself in many ways, alike fatal, alike springing from theological roots. The First Crusade was to a certain extent successful, and a united Church in a united Empire might have founded in Syria a strong Christian kingdom that would have lasted to this day, and saved Europe from its after records of shame. But the kingdom of Palestine was Latin, Latin in its hatred and disdain of the Greek, Latin in its feudal system,¹ Latin in its clinging to the prejudices and rivalries of the West, Latin in its great military orders, Latin in its laws and customs,—the famous Assize of Jerusalem,—above all, Latin in its utter separation from the interests and life of the extraordinary variety of Eastern peoples and sects

¹ "Feudalism was verging towards decrepitude in Europe when it was transplanted with all its mechanism into Palestine. . . . Feudalism in Europe was a step towards development of constitutional government; in Palestine it was but a brilliant pageant" (Stubbs, *Chronicles R. I.*, p. xc.). For a brilliant analysis of the causes of the fall of the Latin kingdom, see same work, pp. lxxxix.—cxi. For the Assize of Jerusalem, see Bury's *Gibbon*, vi. App. 16.

among whom it was established.¹ Its rulers were Western in all save their cruelty and morals, while its ecclesiastics — probably the richest in Christendom—were intent rather on the triumph of the Papacy over the schismatic Churches of the East than the building up of a strong bulwark of Christianity against the foe. As a result, the Greeks were its secret enemies, and its downfall was hailed with as much satisfaction at Constantinople as at Cairo. The most wonderful thing, in fact, about the Latin kingdom of Palestine is not its failure but its success. That a handful of knights should have retained the land for over a hundred years, in spite of overwhelming hostile interests, is no small tribute to the organising genius of its Norman leaders, and to the vitality of the great military orders. They owed much, no doubt, to the disunion of the enemy, for when Nouredin and Saladin united once more the Muslim world, their end came.

The same discord showed itself fatally in the matter of sea-power. Never but once did the full force of the Empire of the West seek to

¹ A good account of these will be found in Conder, *op. cit.* c. vii., "The Native Life in Palestine." Of the Eastern Churches all except the Maronites remained independent of each other, and unreconciled and hostile to Rome, from whose faith they were separated by heresies that had stiffened through centuries into the main dogmas of religion.

recover the tomb of our Lord. When Barbarossa undertook the conquest of Jerusalem, he might have counted upon complete success. But the greatest monarch of his age was ruined by his lack of sea-power; the Greeks would give no help to a rival emperor. With a skill in no wise enfeebled by his age, Frederic transported his troops overland to Asia Minor, avoiding Constantinople and its entanglements. But his untimely death led to the loss of his host.

In their later efforts the Crusaders benefited by the failure of their predecessors. They sought help at exorbitant rates from the Genoese and Venetians. But the first result of their obtaining the ships which had hitherto been at the disposal of the Greeks was the infliction on the Greek Empire of the greatest wrong it has ever suffered. The conquest and sack of Constantinople by the Latins (1204) is one of the great crimes of history. The agent in that outrage was the cunning greed of Venice (*inf.* p. 103, n.); the real cause the schism of Christendom and the hatred of centuries. But no crime proved more fatal to all concerned. The great bronze horses above the gateway of San Marco and the walls glowing with Byzantine mosaics are not the only monuments of the blind Doge Dandolo's selfishness and falsehood. By the

Fourth Crusade and the consequent paralysis of the Eastern Empire,¹ Venice made possible the triumph of the Turk. By her crime Constantinople and the Balkans were handed over to centuries of despotism. By that crime also Venice sowed the seeds of her own ruin; the capture of Constantinople by the Turks (1453) was the commencement of her fall.

The Fourth Crusade was also the real end of the Crusades, viewed as a religious movement. Hereafter individual enthusiasts like St. Louis might lead their subjects in brilliant and adventurous expeditions, but the Crusades as the expression of the religious yearning of Europe were a thing of the past. The cynical selfishness of Venice had rendered that impossible. Henceforth fanaticism and zeal were lesser motives than commercial advantage, while the Papacy diverted to its struggle with the Hohenstaufen the money still raised and the vows still taken for the Holy Land. The final expulsion of the Franks might be delayed, but could not be averted. At last, in 1291, the end came. The fall of Acre — where seventeen independent commands witnessed to the disunion and jealousies of Christendom — was powerless

¹ But the Empire was weakened by the first three Crusades. See Pears, *op. cit.* c. 5; Finlay, iii.

to move the disillusioned consciousness of Europe. The Holy Sepulchre was abandoned; Eastern Christianity was left to its fate; "and a mournful and solitary silence prevailed along the coast which had so long resounded with the World's Debate."

The task which the chivalry and Christianity of Europe failed to accomplish was wrought out ultimately by another means. A few years after Saladin's conquests the Eastern world was destroyed by an overwhelming flood of barbarians. Savage hordes of Mongolians swept down from the central plains of Asia, building huge heaps of the skulls of the slain, and marching their horses over the ruins of cities. "Wherever they passed there was an end to all culture, to all the joys of life, and to the future prosperity of nations. A dreary, savage barbarism pressed upon countries which but a century before could have rivalled in civilisation the very flower of Europe" (Sybel). The intellectual vigour of Islam was for ever broken, its long decay began, and the final dominion of the world secured for the Christian nations of the West.

IV

There are sundry results of the Crusades upon the life of the Church which the historian

must notice. He should not overlook their effect upon the development of the Papacy. The Crusades were from the first a French rather than a German movement. A united Europe in arms against the enemies of the faith should by rights have marched with the Emperor at its head, and under his orders. But the Germans sulked in their tents, and allowed the opportunity to slip into the hands of the popes, who thus became, by the paralysis of the Empire, the military suzerains of Europe. The soldiers of the Cross were the soldiers of Rome, for the Pope alone could remit their vows. Indifferent sovereigns must obey his call to arms, or pay the price in the distrust and rebellion of their subjects. Christendom, trembling for its existence, poured its treasures into the papal coffers; while even the clergy, hitherto exempt from all taxation, had to place at his disposal, as a "Saladin tax," a tenth of their enormous wealth.

But the most fatal influence of Mohammad was that the West too easily learnt his doctrine of founding religion upon the sword. In the Middle Ages proper Christian missions ceased, for the work of St. Francis and St. Dominic lay rather at home than abroad. No Augustine or Columban or Boniface, with the lesser bands of devoted men and women of whom we read in the

Lamb's Book of Heroes, sought out the dwellers in regions unreached by the gospel.¹ We hear instead of the rise of the great military orders—the Hospitallers, the Templars, and the Teutonic knights. Men preferred rather to beat down the heathen into a reluctant Christianity, after the fashion of the caliphs, if anything with less toleration for difference. The few missionaries there were, regarded an inquisitor as a necessary part of their outfit. Cruelty was the mark of the age, even of many of its wisest and best; the pity was that it now became identified with the very religion which had hitherto waged war against it. Muslim populations were everywhere handed over to the sword. 'Our men,' wrote

¹ An exception should perhaps be made for Raymond Lullius (b. 1236, stoned to death by the Muslim 1315). Dr. George Smith and Dr. Pierson (*New Acts of the Apostles*) should, however, be read with caution. It is difficult to know what to think about an impassioned missionary who hoped to convert the Saracens by his invention of a logical machine 'to equal intellects.' But of his glowing love for God there can be no doubt. Cf. Lea, *Inquis.*, iii. 578-590. He was true to his own motto—

He who loves not, lives not;
He who lives by the Life cannot die.

For a full and sympathetic account, see Neander, vii. and viii. *passim*; or the brief but convenient *Missions in the Middle Ages* in his *Memorials of Christian Life*; and for his Arabic chairs established at five Universities 'for the conversion of Jews and Turks,' see Rashdall, *Universities*.

Godfrey to the Pope, 'rode in the blood of the Saracens up to the knees of their horses.' 'The Christian,' cried St. Bernard, 'exults in the death of a pagan, because Christ is glorified.' In utterances like these the God of the Christians becomes like Moloch a consuming fire. We shall note this new spirit in the work of the Teutonic knights in Prussia. We shall see it at work in the Crusade against the Cathari and the other heretics of the West. We shall mark its triumph in the infamous edicts of Frederic II. and the foundation of the Inquisition. From a struggle with the Muslim the Crusades had degenerated into civil war in the very bosom of Christendom.

Nowhere was this growth of the spirit of persecution to prove more fatal than in Spain. The later misfortunes of that country may be traced to the cruelty of the later Inquisition and its suppression of all progressive life and thought. But in justice to Spain we should remember that her intolerance was to a great extent a legacy from the past. The whole history of Spanish Christianity is one long crusade against the Saracen. Intolerance was a necessity of her existence. Spain could never be saved by a useless, or rather destructive, latitudinarianism. Never in the history of the world had a victory been more complete than that of Tarik on the

banks of the Salado. Nearly eight hundred years were spent by the Christians in the undoing of that day's work and the winning back their country from the Muslim. The length of time is remarkable, especially when we remember that the Moors must always have been in a minority. In reality, through their command of the narrow seas, they had at their back the resources of Northern Africa and the reserves of Islam. But these could not have stood for a day against the united chivalry of Christendom. The real cause of the long delay in the recovery of Spain lay in the incessant quarrels of the Christian princes, who had gradually extended their mountain refuges into the kingdoms of Leon (718), Navarre (873), Castile (932), Aragon (1035), and the still existing republic of Andorra. They were more jealous of the growth of their neighbours than careful to rescue their land from the infidel; while the toleration of the Moors for the religion of the vanquished gave them in Andalusia no footing of disaffection or despair. In fact, so slight had been the real Christianity of the people, that many, including some of noble birth, had become converts to Islam.

But as the long duel slowly became the victory of the Cross, the indifference of the early centuries gave place to a bitter hostility. By

the calamitous reverse of Alarcon (1195), the Mohammadans recovered the greater part of their losses, while Africa poured over a vast horde of Egyptians, Nubians, and Persians to renew once more the conquests of Tarik. The vigilance of Innocent III. discerned the danger, and proclaimed a crusade. English and French knights hastened to the succour of the Cross, while the princes of Castile, Navarre, and Aragon suspended their quarrels under pressure of the common foe. On the 16th of July 1212 the combined forces won the decisive victory of Las Navas de Tolosa. The vast army of the Moors was led by the Miramolin—for so the Spaniards called the Commander of the Faithful (Amir-al-Mouminin)—with a scimitar in one hand, the Quran in the other. The battle raged furiously all day, and at one time inclined to the superior forces of the Paynim. The Templars were overborne and destroyed, but the victory was snatched from defeat by the courage and coolness of Rodrigo Ximenez, Archbishop of Toledo. The Miramolin fled to Morocco with the remnant of his army, and the power of the Moors in Spain was for ever broken. By slow degrees they were confined to the mountains of Granada, the subjugation of which was, however, delayed until 1492. But the fall of Cordova (1235), Seville

(1248), and Gibraltar (1309) had really witnessed the end of their power.¹

In Western Europe the "World's Debate" was finished, the victory of the Cross complete. But in the East the future of the Muslim, and the recovery by the Church of his conquests, is still a problem of the future. The method of that recovery and its times knoweth no man; whether by some gigantic struggle of the eagles over the carcase, or by the peaceful and enlightened methods of the missionary. But its certainty is the comfort of every believer.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error wounded writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.

"On the bronze gates of St. Sophia at Constantinople may still be seen—at least it might be seen some years ago—the words placed there by its Christian builder, and left there by the scornful ignorance or indifference of the Ottomans—I. X. NIKΑ, Jesus Christ conquers. It is the expression of that unshaken assurance which in the lowest depths of humiliation has never left the Christian races of the East, that sooner or later theirs is the winning cause."²

¹ For the Spanish Military Orders, see Moeller, p. 359.

² Church, *Influence of Christianity upon National Character*.

CHAPTER III

INNOCENT III

BORN 1160

ELECTED POPE, Jan. 8, 1198

DIED AT PERUGIA, July 16, 1216

*Thus God might touch a Pope
At unawares, ask what his baubles mean
And whose part he presumed to play just now.*

AUTHORITIES.—§ 1. No good life of Innocent. HURTER (4 vols.) (panegyric by pervert). No English translation, but French translation by St. Chéron. MILMAN very good, best part of his work. GREENWOOD, *Cathedra Petri*, vol. v., careful study, but strong Protestant bias. Somewhat out of date. Good sketch in ROCQUAIN, *La Papauté au M. A.*

§ 2. Gregorovius, v. pt. i., for Italy. For Germany, see "Authorities," c. i. § 3. Documents in DÖBERL.

§ 3. Any good history of France (MICHELET, MARTIN, SISMONDI, KITCHIN, English). For John : NORGATE, *Angerine Kings*; HOOK, *Archbishops*; GREEN; ROUND, *Feudal England*; and LINGARD (fair R.C. account).

§ 4. See p. 103, n. The older authorities, MILMAN, etc., in error here through VILLEHARDOUIN. The advanced student should read RIAANT, *Inn. III. Phil. et Bon. de Mont.*

§ 5. See "Authorities" in c. iv. § 4 and c. v. § 2.

INNOCENT III

I

IN the life and deeds of Innocent III. the Papacy reached its consummation. The examination, therefore, of his reign will always be of supreme historical interest, for theory is here turned into accomplished fact.

We have seen in a previous chapter (i. 112 f.) in what the conception of Hildebrand consisted. The successful carrying out of such a theory demanded either infallibility in the supreme head, or else a political wisdom of the rarest order, joined with a character that would win universal respect by disinterestedness and purity. Only into the hands of one who was in more than name the Vicar of God could powers so vast be safely entrusted. Hitherto the advocates of Hildebrand might claim that his theory had lacked fair trial. The master-mind had died in exile, while the later popes who entered into his labours had neither the daring nor the skill to carry out his plan. They had been thwarted

also at every step by difficulties and dangers. But with the opening years of the thirteenth century there came a pope to whom was given the supremest opportunity of the Papacy, and whose character and ability were not unworthy of his favours from fortune. We therefore do more than justice when we test the theory of Hildebrand by its results as carried out under Innocent with a logical completeness denied to the greater genius of its founder. If weighed in the balance under these circumstances it be found wanting, we may be sure that it will be deficient at other and less favourable times.

In the reign of Innocent not the least remarkable fact was his rare good luck. He enjoyed the superfluity of fortune given by success. He accomplished much by his genius and will, more perhaps by the accidents of his times. Europe was in fact for once ready to submit to a spiritual dictator. Hildebrand had been forced into a lifelong struggle with the Empire; during the rule of Innocent the Empire was powerless. Instead of the confused and warring principalities which composed the Europe of Gregory VII.,—excepting, of course, the then united and consolidated Empire,—Innocent was confronted by a new England, a France in which the crown had ceased to be the sport of the greater vassals,

and a Spain gradually forming itself by conquest from a receding Mohammadanism. But the new nationalism, though destined at a later date to overthrow the Papacy, was at first an aid to its triumph. In their mutual hatred, their dread of a powerful Empire, and the lust for conquest of their kings, Innocent found his greatest weapon.

Another factor also in his success was the general weakness and wickedness of the times. Taken as a whole the secular clergy, especially the bishops, were found wanting; while Europe was swept from end to end by spiritual diseases and rebellion. The monasteries, to which in the darkest days of the past men had looked, and not in vain, for leaders of reform, seemed to have exhausted themselves in their last great effort under Bernard; the friars were yet to come. The religious consciousness of Europe turned in its despair to Rome; willing to accept pretensions hitherto rejected if only persuaded that they might save a decaying religion.

II

Born of a Lombard family that has in its time produced nine popes, Lothario Conti lacked no grace of the Christian character save tolerance and gentleness. On the death of the feeble Celestine III., he was unanimously chosen as his

successor at the unprecedented age of thirty-seven (though as yet but in deacon's orders), and saluted by the cardinals under the name of Innocent, in testimony of his blameless life. Never was pope more determined to turn the haughty formula of his consecration into accomplished fact: 'Take the tiara and know that thou art the father of princes and kings, the ruler of the world.' His predecessors had contented themselves with the title of Vicar of Peter; Innocent first assumed the name of Vicar of Christ. 'The Pope,' he said, 'stands in the midst between God and man; below God, above man, less than God, more than man.' To a severe and lofty character Innocent added an inflexible will, inexhaustible resource, and a clear intellect which never missed an opportunity. In his youth he had written a morbid treatise on *The Contempt of the World*. As Milman remarks, he was to show his contempt for the world not by renouncing but by ruling it.

Within a few months of his accession Innocent made his influence felt from the Jordan to the Atlantic. Rome had become the court of appeal for the whole world, before which the supreme interests of kingdoms as well as the details of parochial strife were carried for settlement; but the tribunal had long been proverbial for the

venality and corruption of its officers. 'Deus Romae,' ran the popular sneer, 'non est trinus sed quatrinus.' All this Innocent was determined to sweep away; he would show to all men an example of strict and unbought justice. By this alone could the ideal of Hildebrand secure the recognition of Europe.

His first success was in Italy. Taking advantage of the death of the Emperor Henry VI., the disputed succession, and the execration which the tyrant's cruelties had heaped upon the cause of the Ghibellines, Innocent won the gratitude of his country, and at the same time re-established the temporal dominion of the Papacy, by delivering the land from its German lords. Even the city of Rome, 'the city,' as an old Chronicle justly calls it, 'of roaring beasts,' in which hitherto the shadow of a Senate had disputed the pretensions of the Lateran, took an oath of vassalage 'to uphold the Roman Papacy, and the regalia of St. Peter,' and to defend the same 'against all the world.' For once the great Guelf idea of Italian independence by a confederation under the lead of the popes seemed destined to be realised. The senseless cruelty of Henry had made the victory of the Guelfs the cause of liberty and humanity. Even in Sicily, the great stronghold of German

dominion, the work of Barbarossa seemed undone. The bewildered Constance, trembling for the throne of her son, was forced to yield to the patriots' cry, "Down with the foreigners," and to recognise the feudal rights of the sacred chair over the realm of the Normans—"that extraordinary pretension"—as Milman terms it—"grounded on no right but the assertion of right."

Innocent's work in Italy commands our admiration. But in Germany he sacrificed justice to the interests of the Church. The Empire was crippled by a struggle for the throne; Innocent seized the opportunity to assert that to the Apostolic See belonged the right of examining the qualifications of the elect. He therefore summoned both Philip and Otto to submit their cause to his decision: he would adjudge the crown to the best deserving. Philip, a true son of Barbarossa, refused to compromise the electoral rights. But Otto of Brunswick promised to submit his claims to the judgment of Rome. He could rely on the fears of the Papacy: at all costs the Empire must be saved from becoming hereditary in the hated Hohenstaufen. After three years of civil war Innocent gave his decision. In a celebrated bull he reviews at length the rival claims. He owns that 'against the legality of Philip no objection can be raised,' while Otto

was 'chosen but by a minority.' 'But if son shall succeed to father, brother to brother, the Empire becomes elective, and in what house would the Empire be perpetuated? a house in which one persecutor of the Church succeeds to another.' So after a long harangue on the iniquities of the Hohenstaufen, in which he exhausts the Old Testament for proofs that the sins of the fathers must be visited upon the children, he declares for Otto, 'himself devoted to the Church, of a race devoted to the Church.' Otto at once paid the price of recognition in the celebrated Capitulation of Neuss.¹ For seven years Germany was abandoned to all the horrors of civil war—the second great civil war in that unhappy country directly due to papal arrogance—"A war not of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havoc, plunder, wasting of harvests. Throughout the land there was no law; the highroads were impassable on account of robbers; nothing was spared, nothing sacred,

¹ For the Capitulation of Neuss (1201), see Gregorovius, v. p. 71: "The Capitulation became the first authentic basis for the practical authority of the Pope in the State of the Church. It was recognised by all succeeding emperors, and thus the earlier and unauthenticated donations from the time of Pepin became incorporated in a document of indisputable validity." Cf. Döberl, v. 10, *Promissio Ottonis apud Spiram*, and cf. v. 12 (b) § 7. For the opposite answer of Philip, cf. v. 9.

church or cloister" (Milman). Every year the cause of Innocent grew more hopeless. The Pope was only saved from disaster by the murder of Philip (Christmas 1207). The death of the gentlest and most popular of the Hohenstaufen left Otto the undisputed Emperor. For the first time in the history of the world a king of the Romans called himself 'elect by the grace of God and the Pope.' His after fortunes have been narrated elsewhere (p. 22), how he rebelled against his lord, and how Innocent committed the blunder, fatal as it proved to Empire and Papacy alike, of calling to his aid Frederic, 'the hammer of the Roman Church.'

III

In the dealings of Innocent with France we see the Pope in a better light. He stands out before the world as the champion of the sanctity of marriage. To Innocent it mattered little that Philip Augustus was the most powerful monarch of his age, who had forced his servile clergy to annul his union with Ingeburga of Denmark while he lived in open adultery with the beautiful Agnes of Meran. 'If within one month,' so wrote the Pope to his legate, 'the King of France does not receive his queen with conjugal affection, and treat her with due honour, you shall

subject his whole realm to an interdict.' As Philip refused to submit, the legate summoned a council at Dijon (1199), and proclaimed the curse. In spite of the wrath of the King, the greater part of the clergy at once obeyed. The public worship of God everywhere ceased. 'You prelates,' cried Philip in his fury, 'provided you eat up your vast revenues, and drink the wine of your vineyards, trouble yourselves little about the poor. Take care that I do not mar your feasting and seize your estates.' But Philip was almost alone; his barons mutinous, his people in insurrection against a sovereign who could for such a cause expose a whole nation to the danger of eternal damnation. 'Happy Saladin,' railed the King in his despair, 'he has no Pope above him; I will turn Mohammadan.' The bitter jest covered his defeat. At the Council of Sens (1200) Philip was apparently reconciled to his wife, while Agnes of Meran retired to Normandy. Throughout the land the clanging of the bells, as the people streamed once more into their churches, proclaimed the national joy and the papal victory.

We should salute Innocent as the champion of purity and justice, and pay our tribute to the value of a court of appeal before which the lust of lawless despots must bow, could we believe

that his only interest was to maintain the cause of a poor deserted woman. But we remember the more scandalous adultery—his easy clergy were induced to call it marriage—of Pedro, King of Aragon, with the wife of the Count of Comminges. This adultery was the result of a journey which Pedro made to Rome (1204) to receive his crown—the kings of Aragon had hitherto lacked the insignia of royalty—from the hands of the Pope. As the price of the gift he had declared his realm the fief of St. Peter, and laid his crown of unleavened bread on the altar of the Apostle. So, as the Count of Comminges brought no appeal, Innocent turned his deaf ear to all rumours concerning a monarch so jealous to be ‘true and loyal to my lord the Pope.’

But it is in connection with England that the strength and weakness of Innocent may be best studied. His earliest act was one of justice. At the request of Richard he threatened with excommunication the heirs of the Emperor and the Duke of Austria if they did not set at liberty the King’s hostages, and restore the ransom they had extorted for his release. Owing to this treacherous act of Henry VI.,¹ Richard

¹ The seizure by the Emperor Henry VI. of Richard of England on his journey back from Palestine belongs strictly

and John were at first the supporters of Otto in his attempt to oust Henry's brother, Philip, from the throne. As John was thus the ally of the Pope, Innocent was blind to his crimes; he uttered no censure against his divorce, or his sudden marriage with Isabella, the betrothed wife of one of his French vassals. For this violation of feudal law, as also for his murder of Arthur, Philip Augustus summoned John, as Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, to answer at the bar before the peers of France. John again attempted to turn his alliance with the Pope to his own advantage. On the loss of Château Gaillard, he fled to England, demanding from Innocent the punishment of Philip for breaking his oath to maintain the peace. The Pope responded with a declaration of unlimited power (1203): 'The Decretals, the law of the Empire,¹ declare that if throughout Christendom one of two litigant parties appeals to the Pope, the

to secular history. Richard was brought before the Diet at Speyer, and his ransom fixed at 100,000 marks. The student desirous of understanding a complicated transaction should dismiss the fictions of novelists, and study the question in the learned work of Kneller. Cf. *English Historical Review*, viii. 334-336 and ix. 746; Henderson, *Germany*, c. xix.; and for the agreement itself, Döberl, v. 3.

¹ "The Decretals" are of course in no sense "the law of the Empire." See p. 119 f.

other is bound to abide by his award. The King of France is accused of perjury in violating the existing treaty, to which both have sworn, and perjury is a crime so clearly amenable to the ecclesiastical courts that we cannot refuse to take cognisance of it before our courts.' But John was lost beyond recovery; province after province passed without a struggle into French hands. Hope from Rome there was none, for John himself had become involved in a struggle with his old ally.

This memorable conflict arose from a trivial cause. With the loss of his continental domains John determined to make himself absolute in England. Only by breaking the new spirit of national freedom could he wring from a reluctant land the men and money he needed for his schemes of reconquest. The successful opposition of the Primate, Hubert Walter, who placed himself at the head of the growing discontent, was neutralised by his sudden death. John seized the opportunity to place over the Church a creature of his own. John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, was duly elected by the monks of Canterbury, confirmed by his suffragans, and enthroned. But in a previous meeting the Chapter had elected the sub-prior Reginald, without waiting for the licence of the King.

Reginald had already hurried off to Rome, while the King and De Gray sent twelve monks of Canterbury, lavishly supplied with gold, to represent their cause. Their gold was useless. Innocent heard the pleadings, quashed both elections as irregular, and commanded the monks to elect Stephen Langton. The choice was excellent; no nobler or more patriotic Englishman ever filled the throne of Augustine, but the step was a violent usurpation by the Papacy on the rights of all concerned.

Langton was consecrated by the Pope at Viterbo (1207), but John swore that the new archbishop should never set foot in his realm. Innocent replied with threats of an interdict if Langton were longer excluded from his see. "By the teeth of God," retorted the King, he would drive the bishops and clergy out of England, and send back to the Pope his Romans blind and mutilated. On March 24, 1208, the bishops published the interdict, and fled the realm, 'like faithless shepherds,' adds Matthew of Paris, 'who desert their flocks when they see the wolf coming.' From Berwick to the Land's End all offices of worship ceased. 'Oh, how horrible,'—we quote from the chronicle of an eye-witness,—'how pitiable a spectacle it was in all our cities! To see the doors of the churches

watched and Christians driven away from them like dogs; the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord not offered; no gathering together of the people as wont at the festivals of the saints; the bodies of the dead not admitted to Christian burial, but their stench infecting the air, and the loathsome sight of them appalling the living,—they would be thrown without prayer or toll of bell into some unconsecrated ditch. Of all the means of grace ‘only extreme unction and baptism were allowed. There was a deep silence over the whole realm, while the organs and voices of those who chanted God’s praise were everywhere mute.’¹

The intercourse of God and man was utterly broken off, the crosses were draped with crape, and the host consumed. But the punishment fell only on the innocent and religious. The King himself cared for none of these things. ‘Foul as hell is,’ said his contemporaries, ‘hell itself is defiled by the fouler presence of John.’ His court was a brothel; he had turned his back on the Mass even during the ceremonies of his

¹ Ralph Coggeshall, referring to France. Probably the stringency of the interdict would vary in different dioceses. In this connection the reader should carefully study Gee and Hardy, *Documents illustrative of English Church History*, § 24. Cf. Stevenson’s *Grosseteste*, p. 27.

consecration.¹ The loss by his people of all the machinery of religion was used by the tyrant as a means for filling his coffers. The estates of abbey and cathedral were escheated, the tithe barns of the clergy closed, their concubines seized—the technical name was *focarice*—and held to ransom. Innocent retorted with a decree of excommunication, but for four years John still continued to defy the Pope. Twelve months had sufficed to bring Philip Augustus to his knees, but John had the advantage of more daring wickedness. He guarded against the disloyalty of his barons by demanding the surrender of their children. But nobles and people seem at first to have been indifferent, estranged from Rome by years of exaction and the general decay of religion, or stricken dumb by their fear of the King. “Had John,” writes Milman, “been a popular sovereign, had he won to his own side by wise conciliation, by respect of their rights, by a dignified appeal to their patriotism, the barons and people of England; had he even tempted their worst passions, and offered them a share in the confiscated property of the Church, even the greatest of the popes might have wasted his ineffectual thunders.”

¹ The irreverence of John is quaintly illustrated in Thurston's *St. Hugh of Lincoln*, bk. iv. c. 1.

But the cynical insolence of John saved the Pope from trouble and defeat. The vices and follies of princes have always been the best friends of Rome; and the King, goaded by passion and flattery, rushed blindly to his ruin. His exactions crushed noble, burgher, peasant, and Jew. The clergy who refused to serve him were loaded with chains, or cased in a surcoat of lead. The rumour ran that the King had offered to turn Mohammadan, and had sought to enlist on his side the forces of Islam. The nation was ripe for revolt when, in 1213, Innocent proclaimed his deposition, calling on Philip to head the new crusade, and expel 'and drive out the said John from the kingdom.'

At first it seemed as if the new sense of national unity would rally to John's aid. An enormous army gathered on Barham Down while the English fleet swept the Channel and burned Dieppe. At the moment of apparent triumph the King gave way. He knew that in all his vast host there were few whom he could trust. But the secret of his surrender was rather his passion at all costs to be revenged on Philip for the loss of his continental domains. He saw his chance of a great league against his foe; but for its success his reconciliation with the Papacy was indispensable. So on May 15,

1213, 'at the house of the knights of the Temple,' near Dover, John prostrated himself before the legate Pandulph, promised to receive Langton, to compensate the clergy for all their losses, and 'under no compulsion of force or of fear, but of our good and free will, and by the common consent of our barons,' resigned 'the whole realm of England and the whole realm of Ireland with all their rights and appurtenances to our lord the Pope, for the remission of our sins and those of all our race, as well quick and dead; from now receiving back and holding these as a feudal dependant, from God and the Roman Church.' Every year the King and his successors stipulated to pay in addition to 'the penny of the Blessed Peter' 'seven hundred marks for the realm of England and three hundred for the realm of Ireland.'¹ The dream of Hildebrand was almost accomplished. Canossa finds its complement in the humiliation at Dover. Tuscany, Sicily, Naples, Aragon,

¹ For the full text of John's surrender of the kingdom to the Pope, formally renewed at London on October 3, 1213, see Gee and Hardy, *op. cit.* p. 75. The Church clauses of Magna Carta will be found on p. 79; the whole Charter in Hallam. The surrender of John raises several difficult questions. To what extent was it endorsed by the nation? What was the value of the signature of the witnesses? ['by the common consent of our barons']. .

England and Ireland, all the isles of the sea, as well as the kingdoms that should be conquered from heathen or infidel, had become the acknowledged fiefs of St. Peter; the emperors were made and unmade by his decision, while the Capets owed their throne to his award.

The humiliation of John, 'non formosa sed famosa,' failed in its purpose. By the great battle of Bouvines¹ the league against Philip was broken up, and John driven back to his island kingdom. The after story is familiar to every child; how he found the nobles banded together in a definite claim for liberty and law under the leadership of Langton, how "with but seven horsemen in his train John found himself face to face with a nation in arms," and how on June 15, 1215, he was forced to set his seal to the Great Charter of freedom. 'They have given me four-and-twenty kings,' he cried, as he flung himself on the floor in his fury; and his consciousness of crippled tyranny drove him to seek aid from his new overlord the Pope. He promised to renounce all his rights over abbey

¹ The reader should grasp the great importance of this battle, "the greatest single day," as Henderson rightly calls it, "in the history of the Middle Ages." Cf. Green, p. 121, and *supra*, p. 23. The battle is described at length, together with plan of campaign, by Oman, *op. cit.* 457-480.

and see, and take the cross of the Crusader. The answer of Innocent is one of those awkward facts over which apologists for Rome have laboured in vain. 'The kingdom of England,' wrote Innocent, 'is mine, mine by homage and fealty and tribute paid.' He could therefore 'no longer pass over in silence such audacious wickedness, committed in contempt of the Apostolic See.' The Great Charter was annulled, 'a treaty not only base and ignominious, but unlawful and unjust'; while Langton was suspended from the primacy he had so nobly used. 'Every anointed king,' adds Innocent, 'is raised above the law by reason of the unction.' Despotism never received a fuller sanction. But barons and burghers set Innocent and his bulls at defiance, and the death of Pope and King alone saved these strange allies from witnessing their common defeat. As we gaze to-day in the British Museum on the old Charter, brown and shrivelled, we see written therein not only the principles of English liberty, but the demonstration by hard fact of the impossibility of the Hildebrandine ideal. The universal dominion of the Papacy might be achieved; its result would not be to enforce justice and religion on the under-kings in one commonwealth of God, but to annul charters of freedom,

to throw over the lust of despots the shield of a papal alliance, and to crush nationalism and liberty by the steel bands of a spiritual tyranny.

IV

In the East Innocent brought about a similar success, an even deeper failure. The passion of his life was the salvation of Palestine. He was not deterred by the failures of the past: 'If the soldiers of the Cross would walk in the way of the Lord, not as those before them, in revellings and drunkenness, . . . they would trample down their enemies as mice under their feet.' 'Behold,' he pleaded with the clergy of France, 'the Crucified is crucified afresh . . . again His enemies take up their taunting reproach, If Thou be the Son of God, save Thyself.' At the first his appeals were vain. Europe was weary of the disasters and expense of the Crusades, the perils from which few returned. The halo of religion and chivalry had vanished, benevolence soured by Roman rapacity, enthusiasm turned to distrust. At last Innocent succeeded, through the preaching of Fulk of Neuilly and the Abbot Martin, in gathering together a new army of the Cross (1201). Deputies were despatched to Venice to solicit her help. 'Illustrious Venetians,' said the Marshal of

Champagne, 'we are sent by the greatest and most powerful barons of France to implore the aid of the masters of the sea for the deliverance of Jerusalem. They have enjoined us to fall prostrate at your feet, nor will we rise from the ground until you have promised to avenge with us the injuries of Christ.' The old Doge Dandolo seized the occasion for the profit and aggrandisement of the Republic. He first wrung eighty-five thousand marks from the Crusaders as the cost of their transport, then used the hosts of the Cross for the conquest of Zara, and the capture and sack of Constantinople (1204).¹ The Greek Empire was overturned, and a Count of Flanders raised to the throne. The feudal system of the West was hastily established, and the sanctuaries and monasteries of the conquered handed over to a Latin clergy. These banished the language, ritual, and usages of a Church whose schism lay in its thousand

¹ For this outrage Venice alone was not responsible. The Emperor Philip found time amid his domestic troubles to nurse the dream of the union of East and West under his sway. Even before the expedition sailed the leaders had agreed to hoodwink the Crusaders, and divert the expedition to the service of Venice and Germany. For all this, and the "cooked" official account of Villehardouin, see Pears, *op. cit.*; also Bury's *Gibbon*, vi. p. 527. The mark at this time should be reckoned at about 52 francs. So elsewhere.

years of resistance to Roman pretensions. Christendom once more rejoiced in its one fold and one shepherd; one centre of government, Rome; one overlord, the Pope.

The guilt of this crime cannot in fairness be said against Innocent. Before the expedition sailed he had showed his distrust of Venice by attaching the special condition that no Christian town should be assailed. After the event his letters denounced the outrage in the loftiest terms. The horrors of the storm by a dissolute soldiery of the wealthiest city¹ in the world filled him with disgust. He heard how the Crusaders had enthroned a prostitute in Santa Sophia, broken up the altars of the churches, and plundered their relics.² Bronze statues were melted down into coin, the treasures of libraries burnt, the works of art destroyed. 'By their deeds of darkness,' he thundered, 'sparing neither religion nor age nor sex, practising fornications in the sight of men,' the Latins have become 'worse than dogs.' But the wrath

¹ For a description of Constantinople at this time, see Pears, *op. cit.*; also F. Harrison, *Meaning of History*, c. 11.

² The list of these relics gives a remarkable insight into the spirit of the Middle Ages. See Pears, and note especially "the great drops of blood He had shed at Gethsemane, one of His first teeth, and some of the hair of His childhood." Cf. Grosseteste's attitude, Stevenson, *op. cit.* 263, 264.

of the Pope exhausted itself in words. No interdict overwhelmed the perjured soldiers of the Cross. Innocent even succeeded in persuading himself that the crime was a judgment of Providence on the heresies of the Greeks. 'Samaria,' he writes, 'has now returned to Jerusalem. God has transferred the Empire of the Greeks from the proud to the lowly, from the superstitious to the religious, from the schismatics to the Catholics, from the disobedient to the devoted servants of Christ.' The self-deception was expedient and easy. At last a patriarch of Constantinople acknowledged the rule of St. Peter, and his legates dictated a constitution for an ancient Church. For the first and last time a Byzantine emperor received his crown in Rome from the hands of the Pope.

Innocent would have done better had he remained firm to his first instincts of right. When the policy of this world compelled him to deny his ideals, he wrote the epitaph on his infallible rule. Within fifty years of his death the Latin Empire of Constantinople was destroyed; but the temporary union begotten of violence and hate had rendered the reconciliation of East and West more difficult than ever. To the disastrous results of this crime we have already referred. That Constantinople now

groans beneath the tyranny of the Turk must be attributed in no small degree to the weakness of Innocent at one of the most critical hours in the history of the Church.

V

The greatest difficulty of Innocent was the problem of heresy. Nowhere did he seem more successful; in nothing did he sow the seeds of more abiding evil. The problem needed for its solution other faculties than a cool head and calculating intellect. Europe was crying for bread; he offered a stone. She needed an apostle; he provided a statesman. She asked for the gospel; he called a great Council in the Lateran, which stereotyped the false tendencies of Latin theology. A greater heart would have sought to do away with the causes of the disease; his cold intellect decided to heal with cautery and knife.

The difficulties of Innocent were undoubtedly great. Catharism did not hide itself in holes and corners. In its consciousness of strength it held public disputations with the orthodox, and even called ecumenical councils of its own. In Languedoc half the people had abandoned the Catholic faith, while Italy was honeycombed with the evil. When the Bishop of Carcassone threatened his flock for heresy, he was expelled.

the city, and a heavy fine inflicted on any who should have dealings with him. In many places Manichæan dualism had ousted the Trinitarian faith. Rome itself was filled with 'the weed of heresy.'

Innocent could not tamely watch the gradual suppression of the Church entrusted to his keeping. Toleration was slowly leading to destruction. At all costs the Cathari must be crushed. We should do Innocent the justice of owning that before resorting to persecution he made some efforts to win back the lost by purging the churches and restoring discipline. But in this he was thwarted by the clergy. They chafed at the interference of Rome, and preferred the spread of heresy to the reform of their lives. Nor were the toils of missionaries of more avail. In 1206 a Spanish prelate, Diego di Azevedo, on learning the powerlessness of the Church, offered to go among the people barefooted and poor like the apostles, and see what could be wrought by preaching. He was accompanied by his sub-prior, Domingo de Guzman, and by numerous volunteers from Citeaux. By twos and threes they wandered, without purse and scrip, among the towns and villages of Languedoc, seeking to recover the sheep that were lost. The direct results were scanty; indirectly the

effort was one of the great events of history, for out of it grew the great Dominican order.

On the failure of these milder measures Innocent determined to put forth the whole strength of the Church. In impassioned appeals he called Europe to a new Crusade. His efforts seemed fruitless, but the murder of the papal legate, Peter Castelnau (1208), like the assassination of Becket, saved the Papacy from defeat. A thrill of horror ran through Christendom; the blood of the martyr called for vengeance. In every market-place fiery monks inflamed the passions of the people, and offered Paradise and plunder to all who would serve for forty days against Raymond of Toulouse and his heretic subjects. The piety, chivalry, and scum of Europe hastened to the help of the Lord against the mighty. 'Languedoc,' said Honorius III., 'is a land of iron and brass of which the rust can only be removed by fire.' By an atrocious series of Crusades lasting over thirty years, 'the rust' was at last removed, heresy washed out with blood. Justice, faith, and humanity were outraged in a manner that would have disgraced the heathen hordes of the Tartars. The soldiers of the Cross spared neither the aged in their cruelty nor woman in their lust. Mutilation became a common practice; the pregnant were

crushed to death with stones. The fall of Beziers was followed by the indiscriminate slaughter of twenty thousand of its inhabitants. When Arnaud of Citeaux, the papal legate, was asked if the Catholics should be spared, 'Kill them all,' he replied; 'God will know His own.'¹ The whole city was then delivered to the flames. Everywhere garrisons were put to the sword; "Veni Creator Spiritus" sang the clergy as they hounded on their soldiers to the massacre. On the capture of Lavour four hundred were burned in one great pile. On the rare occasions of capitulation citizens were offered the choice between Rome and the stake. Recantations were few; the Cathari, true to their principles, leaped exultingly into the flames.

At last the Crusade finished its work. The garden of France was turned into a wilderness, its people reconciled to the Church. Two permanent results demand attention. The one was the founding by the Council of Toulouse (1229) of the notorious Inquisition. Rome knew that the sects destroyed by fire and sword would spring up once more from the fruitful field of priestly corruption unless held down by

¹ This incident is often denied by Roman Catholic historians. It rests on the authority of Cæsar of Heisterbach (c. 1220), *Dial. Mir.*, ed. Strange, i. 302, and in its setting is evidence, at any rate, of current opinion and approval.

unceasing vigilance. To this crowning infamy of spiritual despotism we shall return again. The other result, the consolidation of France, belongs rather to political history. Nevertheless, its effects on the history of the Church are of great importance. At the close of the Crusade, Innocent, in spite of his strong sense of the injustice, was driven by his clergy to deprive Raymond of two-thirds of his territory. Hitherto the Counts of Toulouse had been rather the rivals than the vassals of the kings at Paris, vassals with larger territories, greater wealth; rulers of a Gallo-Romanic population that had few ties of language or race with the Franks of the North. The spoil of Toulouse was the making of France; but the first effect of that unity was the Babylonish Captivity at Avignon, and the fall of the papal supremacy.

VI

What, then, is the verdict of history on the reign of this Pope? The spectacle is indeed marvellous. A writer of his own age describes him 'as one who had no equal in his own day, whereby he was able to do acts of miraculous power and greatness.' We see him ruling the world according to his will. On the surface all is success. Church, State, and Society own the

supremacy of Cæsar; there is no power that can withstand the march of his ideas. But a deeper analysis shows us "the laborious and only outwardly victorious struggle of a great will against the spirit of an age whose depths he did not rule" (Gregorovius). If our examination of his reign be correct, his infallible rule as the Vicar of Christ was the cause to Europe of unnumbered woes; his splendid successes prepared the way for the disasters that overwhelmed the Papacy; his own hand forged the sword which wounded Rome to the quick.

Innocent's greatness as a ruler of men is beyond dispute; his moral character has been variously judged. After his death Luitgarde, the venerated prioress of Brabant, publicly announced that she saw him in Purgatory wrapped round with flames. We may put aside the narrow opinions of fanatics, for judgment on Innocent should be tempered with mercy. His very defects are outcome of his whole-hearted belief in his mission. His one aim was the realisation of his ideal; that ideal the Old Testament Theocracy under the direction of the Pope. To him, as to his lesser imitators, the Church had become an end in itself; "nothing reminded him of Jesus the Shepherd of souls."¹

¹ See the exquisite character sketch by Sabatier, *Saint Francis*, pp. 93, 94.

Francis he could never understand ; to the ideal of the saint of Assisi he gave only the sanction of a suspended judgment. His lack was sympathy and love. In his letter to John, the grandest document of the papal power, he tells the King that 'as the rod lay beside the tables of the law in the ark of the Lord, so lie the terrible powers of destruction and the gentleness of mercy in the breast of the Pope.' Gentleness and mercy he forgot ; he preferred rather to encompass the Church with terror. "He never suspected the unsatisfied longings, the dreams unreasoning perhaps but beneficent and divine, that were dumbly stirring in the depths of men's hearts" :

Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped.

And so with a true instinct Rome has ever denied to her splendid Innocent her supreme reward of canonisation. "She perceived that he was rather king than priest, rather Pope than saint." Judged merely as a king his life was a magnificent failure. He built his house, splendid, four-square, upon the sands, and the tide of time has swept it away.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHAINS OF THE LAW

Before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.—GAL. iii. 23.

*For this,
The gospels and great teachers laid aside,
The decretals, as their stuff margins show,
Are the sole study.*

PAR., ix. 128-131.

AUTHORITIES.—The subject dealt with in the following chapter lies on the border-land between Ecclesiastical History and Law. I have found the following of most value:—

§§ 1 and 2. JENKS, *Law and Politics in the M. A.* (The student had better begin with this; but much of it lies outside our special scope.) POLLOCK and MAITLAND, *History of the Laws of England* (espec. i. 469–495. See note, p. 118). MAITLAND, *Canon Law in the Church of England*. (The mastery of this epoch-making work absolutely necessary. For similar conclusions to Maitland, see RASHDALL, *Univs.* For the opposite view—to which Maitland an answer—STUBBS, *Report Eccles. Courts Commission*, 1883, vol. i. Also his *Lectures on Med. and Mod. Hist.*, cc. 13, 14.) LEA, *Studies in Church History*. TARDIF, *Histoire des Sources du Droit Canonique* (espec. bks. vii. cc. 4, 5; viii. cc. 1, 3; xi. c. 12); also WASSERSCHLEBEN, s.v. in Herzog. For Justinian, GIBBON, c. 44. See also note, p. 143.

§ 3. LEA, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, 3 vols. (Read at any rate cc. 17, 18, and 22. “Indulgences” in v. iii.) ALLEN, *Instits.*, 407–422. MILMAN, ii. c. 1; and for severe strictures, LUTHARDT, *Christian Ethics*, i. 270–297. See also note, p. 138, and note, p. 141.

§ 4. The standard work is LEA’s erudite *Inquis. of the M. A.*, 3 vols. Note MAITLAND, *op. c. c.* 6 (of great importance). For growth of toleration, BP. CREIGHTON, *Persecution and Tolerance*, cc. 2–4. (With c. 2, cf. Lea, c. 5.) Also note, p. 154. For the heretics, see chap. v. § 2, “Authorities” and text.

THE CHAINS OF THE LAW

THE greatest factor in the building up of the despotism of Rome, and the evolution of the Hildebrandine ideal, will be found in the complex and far-reaching legal system of the Church. A subordinate part thereof, the infamous Inquisition, has been the stock theme of all writers; but the system as a whole has scarcely received the attention it deserves. In the following chapter we shall sketch the origin and results of the Canon Law, then pass to its more familiar outcome, the Inquisition, its causes and consequences.

I

The difficulties of the student in understanding the law system of the Papacy arise from two causes. In the first place, he has been taught by Austin and other theorists that laws are the commands of the State; so unconsciously he has come to regard the State as the source of all law. Then again, in England at any rate, there have

been for centuries few exceptions to this great idea, while even on the Continent the facts which would have given pause to his theory have disappeared since the great Revolution swept Europe of anachronisms and abuses. But the student will make little advance so long as he is fettered by this fiction. To the medieval jurist law was not the imposing outcome of royal despotism or democratic deliberation it means to us to-day; it was a matter strictly territorial and local. The fief, not the State, was its centre and source; the unit out of which the society, politics, and jurisprudence of the Middle Ages were built up. Every seigneur, and their name was legion, exercised justice high and low, had his own courts, his own gallows, and to a great extent his own code. The majesty of the old imperial law had given place to the bondage of capricious customs which varied in almost every barony.

But not all men, even in the palmiest days of feudalism, were men attached to a fief. Three classes stood out from the general system, the priest, the merchant, and the Jew. Each of these therefore will have his own code and his own courts. To the medieval jurist all this seemed so perfectly natural that he could not

realise a society founded otherwise. He had not yet dreamed of the ideal of government as the equality of law through the length and breadth of the land. He saw nothing incongruous in every class of men, every district, every city, seeking to isolate itself within a jurisprudence of its own, and refusing the jurisdiction of any but their "peers," *i.e.* their equals or caste.

The special law systems of the merchant and the Jew do not here concern us. In the one we have the foundation of the Hansa; the other gave to the kings the chief source of their wealth. But while the Jew was the king's man, and the merchant guilds only slowly won their freedom, the Church from the first had stood outside the Teutonic feudal system. "In the early days of the Frank dominion the churches lived under Roman Law. For one thing, the Christian emperors had legislated pretty freely on ecclesiastical matters long before the Teutons were converted to Christianity; and the Merovingians could hardly venture to meddle with the organisation of that mighty power which had destroyed their ancient gods and done so much to give them the victory over their enemies. For another, the churches were corporations; and it took the Teutonic mind a long time to grasp the highly complex notion of a

corporation.”¹ So from the fall of the Empire onwards we have the Church with a law of her own, and necessarily therefore courts and punishments of her own, living in the midst of Celtic or Teutonic tribes in which law was a matter of the clan or the fief. In all Western Europe the only law that is not local and territorial is the “common law,”² *i.e.* universal law, of the Roman Church.

The law of the Church was at first the Roman code—familiar to us from the work of Justinian—modified by the enactments of Councils, in so far as these had received imperial sanction. But when the popes stepped into the place of the emperors the Church of the West quietly repudiated the system which had been her foster-mother, and substituted in its place the canons of Councils and the case-law of the popes. The absolute subordination of the spiritual to the temporal authority upon which Constantine and his successors had insisted thus gave place to an equality, in due course to develop into claims of

¹ Jenks, *op. cit.* 27. For the Teutonic difficulties over corporations, see Pollock and Maitland, i. 469–495. In this interesting section Prof. Maitland traces the great medieval influence of St. Paul’s *locus classicus*, 1 Cor. xii. 12, in the development of the legal idea of a corporation.

² This was the usual meaning of “common law” on the Continent. Its English significance is a local peculiarity.

supremacy. Charles the Great, it is true, in his general revival of older traditions, reduced the Church once more under the strict control of the State, even forcing upon Rome the well-known alteration in the Nicene Creed (*filioque*); but in this as in much else he was both before and behind his age. The wide recognition within a few years of his death of the authority of the False Decretals—the boldest and most successful forgery that the world has ever seen—shows the real drift of the times. The great forger not only repeatedly declares that all imperial legislation is subordinate to the spiritual, but claims for the Papacy universal appellate jurisdiction, and thereby a supreme power of legislation. The familiar imperial axiom, ‘What pleases the Prince has the force of law,’ may not have received the sanction of any Council as applying to the Bishop of Rome, but popular sentiment is greater than positive enactment. Europe had been too long nurtured on the imperial idea to resist the forgers when they transferred this power in all its fulness to her spiritual Cæsars. Thus the popes gradually changed their power of declaring law by rescripts dealing with specific cases, into a power of making laws that should be binding on the whole Church. From the days of Nicholas I. onwards the law of the Church

is neither the old Roman jurisprudence nor the capitularies of Charles the Great—codes in fact which in the general anarchy sank almost into oblivion—but the papal system of decretals and canons. To doubt their validity, said Nicholas I., was to call in question the authority of the Old and New Testaments. To dispute their authority laid a man open to the charge of heresy.

By possessing its own laws the Church also possessed its own courts, for the essence of feudalism lay in a man's right to trial by his "peers." Where law was personal and territorial this was inevitable. The Frank, the Roman, the Goth, the Burgundian, however intermingled, must each be tried by his own code, a code which could only be interpreted in his own courts. So with the Canon Law of the Church. This could only be expounded by the Courts Christian familiar with its language and peculiarities. To the medieval statesman all this would seem a matter self-evident and seemly; his only difficulty would be as to the extent of the jurisdiction of the several courts.

So far our legal problem has seemed simple. The fall of the Empire was the downfall of the Justinian jurisprudence; its place was taken by the Teutonic codes of the conquerors. Law sinks from its imperial claims into the law of

the tribe and fief, each separate tribe and fief possessing also its own tribunals. Coexisting with these are the codes and courts of the Church. The former are local and territorial; the latter "common" or universal. But from the eleventh century onwards the problem becomes complicated by two new factors, the revival of the old Roman jurisprudence and the rise of the modern State.

The wonderful deepening and broadening of the stream of human culture which has been called, not inaptly, the Renaissance of the twelfth century, took expression in Italy in a renewed study of Roman Law. Bologna, long noted as a school of liberal arts, became under the teaching of Irnerius (1100–1130) the great university for the study of the Code and Pandects of Justinian. The influence of this revival was twofold. The great Bolognese doctors transferred to the emperors all the powers and claims, ecclesiastical and civil, that the most servile jurists of Rome had ever ascribed to their despotic princes. "Absolutism," says Bryce, "became the civilian's creed." The Hohenstaufen were not slow in learning their lesson, or in the assertion of prerogatives hallowed by age and law. Thus the first result was the fatal struggle of the Empire and Papacy.

A second result was the codification of the Canon Law. Hitherto the law of the Church had been gathered from a chaos of papal rescripts, conciliar canons, and civil enactments. The advantages which the Empire derived from its possession of a definite and venerable system, in which the Emperor was recognised as the fountain of all authority, impressed upon the papal jurists their want of a similar code. In the *Concordia Discordantium Canonum* of Gratian, a monk of Bologna, the Church found the exact instrument she needed. In this work Gratian applies to the materials collected by a succession of canonists¹ the scientific method of Abailard. Influenced by the success of the latter's *Sic et Non* (i. 229), Gratian presents his readers with both sides of every disputed question, and all the conflicting authorities. The *Decretum* of Gratian—to give the book its more familiar title—at once supplanted all rivals, and became the recognised text-book of the schools. The importance of this work it is difficult to exaggerate. The *Decretum* is one of those books—not necessarily great in themselves—

¹ For the canonists before Gratian, see Luthardt, *op. cit.* p. 290, or Wasserschleben (Herzog). If the reader will turn over the two (Gratian and Abailard) in Migne he will speedily see their identity of method.

which take the world by storm because they first clearly embody certain latent tendencies of their age. Furthermore, the book was published at the right time (1142) and in the right place. The new universities were springing into existence when the prestige of Bologna secured the adoption of Gratian in every law school of Europe. The authority of a text-book in the Middle Ages, whether Aristotle, Justinian, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, or Gratian, was a power of which to-day we have but little conception. The vast influence of the *Decretum*, in which the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, including of course the False Decretals, are placed on a level in point of authority with the canons of General Councils, was felt everywhere in the triumph of the ideas for which Hildebrand had contended.

The success of Gratian suggested to the Papacy a new method of imposing its will upon Christendom more powerful than the appeal to arms of its rival. In 1234 Raymond de Penaforte published for Gregory IX. five books of recent *Decretals*. These were followed by further editions known as *Extravagants*¹ and *Clementines* (1318). With these the golden age of papal legislation came to an end, but their study in nearly every university of Europe gave

¹ *I.e.*, extra decretum vagantes.

the popes an international battalion devoted to the defence and propagation of ultramontane ideas.

The revival of the Roman Law, though not without influence on Scotland, did not affect the development of England. England is, however, pre-eminently the country in which the student can trace the stages in the growth of the other and greater factor, the rise of the State Jurisprudence and Courts. The steps by which the Crown slowly crippled and destroyed the rival tribunals of the fief, and imposed one system of "common law" as opposed to fief law, only concern us here in their results. But one incident in the struggle merits our notice. When Henry II. initiated the rule of law and laid the foundations of our present judicial organisation, there was no slight danger lest the Crown should become absolute, as indeed, in spite of greater obstacles, it became in France. "If Henry of Anjou had been succeeded by men as able as himself, with the magnificent machinery of the royal courts to back him, and with no great feudatories to hold him in check, England might have come to take her law from the mouth of the King alone."¹ But the successors of Henry were not men of his mighty mould, while they were further crippled by the

¹ Jenks, *op. cit.* pp. 42, 43.

triumph of Becket over the ablest of the Angevins. When Thomas Becket at Northampton (1164) refused to take either the law of the land or the law of the Church from the mouth of the King his motives may have been, according to our modern ideas, the pride and selfishness of caste; in reality his death made it utterly impossible for the King's will, even the will of a Henry, to have in England the force of law. From the death of Becket the power of the royal courts grows but little until Edward I., "consciously or unconsciously, by genius or good luck . . . propounds that great idea which crowns the work of England in the history of law." With the rise of Parliaments the danger of the absolutism of the royal courts passes away, and we enter upon the modern era of government by statute law.

Becket is but an incident, no small incident, in the rise of the law-system of the State. But the fight of Becket¹ reveals how inevitable was

¹ Space has compelled me to suppress a study on Becket. I can only give here the chief authorities for his life. We really suffer from excess; the difficulty is to construct a harmony. For all 'sources,' see Robertson's *Materials*, 7 vols. (Rolls'). The best life is by Morris (2nd ed., R.C.). Stanley's *Memorials of Cant.* should be corrected by Abbott, *St. T. of Cant.* For lesser essays, see Freeman, vol. ii.; also *Cont. Rev.*, 1878 (in answer to Froude's *Short Studies*, vol. iv.); and Miss Norgate

the conflict between the growing claims of the statute law and the older system of the Church. At first the State was too concerned in its struggle with the clan and the fief (a struggle in which on the Continent it was far from successful) to entangle itself in the greater controversy with the spiritual power. But as the clan and the fief were slowly welded into the modern State, as the common law of the State overrode the law of the barony, the royal courts and Parliament turned their attention to their real antagonist.

II

For the sake of clearness we must retrace our steps. From the middle of the eleventh century onwards there are in Europe four different systems of law, each depending on a different root-idea. The two oldest are the law of the tribe (Teutonic) or clan (Celtic), and the law of

(*Dict. Eng. Biog.*). For the constitutional aspect, see Maitland, *op. cit.* c. iv., where a somewhat new view is propounded. Vol. ii. of Abbott contains an interesting study of medieval miracles. But neither the historical materials nor the physical and physiological knowledge for an adequate investigation of this extraordinary side of medieval life are yet, I fear, within our reach. The R.C. view is sensibly stated by Newman, *Apologia*, App. B. See also Allen, *Instits.*, pp. 333-345, *The Historical Significance of the Miracle*.

the Empire (Roman). Of the first the law of the State is a larger growth, of the second the law of the Church a sort of understudy. Conflict was inevitable, and the history of law is the history of that conflict. From the eleventh century onward we see the slow death of the law of the tribe, strangled by the growth of the State and the revival of the Imperial Jurisprudence. This last is from the first in bitter rivalry with the law of the Church. Behind the Innocents and the Hohenstaufen and the armies that they set in motion we see the shadowy forms of lawyers and canonists, each struggling for the triumph of his own system. But the real nature of the struggle is somewhat hidden by it being decided through the sword. The more open conflict between the law of the State and the law of the Church is of later growth. To-day each of the four systems has its survivals, but the law of the State alone holds the field as the law, ideal and actual, of society. This triumph was the task of centuries, only accomplished in fact by the Reformation and the Revolution. Like all the battles of lawyers, the fight was not in the open. We read of few alarums and excursions, there is little of the pageantry of war. Kings and statesmen were unwilling to run the risk of a second Becket.

So craftily, warily, insidiously, the lawyers of the Crown blunted the weapons of the ecclesiastics, or even turned them against themselves.¹

If attention be directed to the precise nature of the conflict between the law of the State and the law of the Church, the student should not be misled by modern ideas. He must not imagine that men saw, as he sees to-day, the impossibility of their coexistence. On the contrary, as Dr. Jenks points out, "from the ninth century to the close of the Middle Ages not the most autocratic monarch of Europe, not the most secular of lawyers, would have dreamed of denying the binding force within its proper sphere of the Canon Law." The judgment of Professor Maitland is equally emphatic: "Kings and Parliaments and secular justices had it within their power to narrow the province of the law ecclesiastical, and might hedge it round with writs of prohibition, which as a matter of fact the bishops and their officials would not transgress; but it was not for kings or Parliaments or secular justices to make or declare the law of the Church, or to dictate the decisions of the Church's courts." The only

¹ For a remarkable instance of this, see Maitland, *op. cit.* c. 5, "'*Execrabilis*' in the Court of Common Pleas," which the student should master.

question that arose was over the precise nature and extent of that "proper sphere." But both sides recognised certain matters as beyond dispute. The State never doubted that all questions of faith and creed belonged to the law system of the Church. Thus to the medieval mind the Inquisition was legal and natural; the business of the State was to carry out its punishments. In England, for instance, all sentences of excommunication were enforced by the secular power without let or dispute. The Church also claimed the control of all matters connected with marriage, and matters that involved the breach of an oath, this last claim almost boundless in days when all the transactions of business and politics were ratified by solemn appeals. In England the Courts Christian successfully asserted an exclusive jurisdiction in the probate of wills. To the Church also was handed over the punishment, by its system of penitentials, of breaches of the moral law; though this last could not continue unchallenged when the State had better developed its own codes and police. Broadly considered, the disputed border-line between the two lay round matters of ecclesiastical property. Here gradually and slowly the State encroached on the preserves of the Church, annexing to itself one

by one, "without any pitched battle, any shout of triumph, or wail of defeat," the disputed spheres of influence, and finally sweeping away competing systems. But this last was the work of centuries.

Conflict between the two laws was of course a conflict between their special courts — the Courts Christian and the Courts of the King. Here again there were certain matters beyond dispute, though difficulties constantly arose on the wavering line between "spiritual" and "temporal." These frontier-disputes, as we may term them, varied in different countries. In England the battle was chiefly waged over the immunity of the clergy from secular justice and the tight grasp of the secular courts on all matters that touched tithes or patronage. In both these matters, in spite of the efforts of Becket, Grosseteste,¹ and others, the State succeeded in establishing her claims.

The second of these need not detain us,

¹ As I shall often have occasion to refer to Grosseteste, I here acknowledge the great value of the *Life* by F. S. Stevenson. But students should not neglect Dr. Luard's *Letters of Grosseteste*, with excellent preface. The great fight between Grosseteste and the State concerning the law of marriage is excellently told by Makower, *Constit. Hist. of Church of England*, pp. 422, 423. I shall deal with the question whether Grosseteste can rightly be regarded as a reformer (Lechler and others) in a later volume.

but the first should not be overlooked. The immunity of clerks from all liability to the secular tribunals is of course incapable of defence from the standpoint of the nineteenth century. But the careful student will note that in reality this was no extraordinary demand of sacerdotal arrogance. The right slowly developed as an integral factor in the evolution of law. We have already seen how the break-up of the Empire by the Teutonic invasions led every order of society to seek 'peculiar' and immunities of its own. The Church only differed from other corporations in her greater power of turning this tendency into accomplished fact. She carefully shielded with the terrors of excommunication privileges that were really the outcome of Teutonic decentralisation. To her acknowledged immunity from secular jurisdiction she even attempted to add immunity from secular accusation. The disciple, she urged, is not above his master, nor should children reprove their parents. In this last claim, except in Hungary, she failed; fortunately for herself. The evils arising from the immunity of clerks were bad enough; they would have been a thousand times worse if the clergy had been elevated into an inaccessible caste.

We must be fair; nor allow our judgment to be distorted by our modern ideals. In the darker ages, until the revival of civil law, there can be no question that the jurisdiction of the Church, with its codes, courts, and privileges, was in the main a benefit to humanity. In a rude and barbarous age when might claimed to be right, even in later days when the royal courts were not the impartial courts of justice with which we are now familiar, the Church flung the shield of her protection over the unprotected, guarding with her "benefit of clergy" not only her priests but all widows, orphans, and scholars. Again, the apologists for these clerical immunities may point to the mildness of ecclesiastical punishments as no small factor in the growth of civilisation. Instead of such monstrous penalties as blinding, castration, or breaking on the wheel for petty assault or theft, the bishops inflicted fines and imprisonments. Even the foolish inadequacy of their punishment for the more serious offences of clerks was better than the brutality of the King's justice.¹

¹ See, for instance, the interesting specimen of medieval village life in Abbott, *op. cit.* § 710, where a man is blinded and castrated for a petty theft. Such facts will account for the undoubted popularity of Becket's attempt to help all who

Nevertheless, when all has been said that fairness demands, the fact of experience remains that the immunity of clerks is as fatal to the growth of a nation's life as the privilege of nobles or the irresponsibility of governments. The nation is one, and no part of the community can claim exemption from the burdens of the rest without a weakening of national life. Such selfishness reacts most upon the class itself; privilege soon loses the consciousness that the measure of its rights is the extent of its duties. The priestly caste, cut off from the sufferings of others, in the days when the peoples were groping blindly after law and justice, became more anxious to preserve their immunities than assist in the development of the general liberty. Here and there we find exceptions like Stephen Langton or Grosseteste; nevertheless the rule holds true. Very different would have been the more rapid growth of justice, especially on the Continent, if the strongest and most sympathetic class in

could read to escape from the civil to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The fiendish cruelty of medieval civil punishments puts into the shade the horrors of the Inquisition. They may be best studied in the Schloss at Nuremburg. For the beneficial effect of the Benefit of Clergy on the Civil Law, see Stephen, *Hist. Crim. Law*, i. 463-478. For the whole subject, see the second essay in Lea, *Studies*.

the nation, the priests, instead of being exempt from the tyranny and cruelties of secular courts, had been one with the people in their sufferings, one also in the seeking of a common deliverance. Selfish privilege always exacts with compound interest its final payments from the privileged class itself. We see this abundantly illustrated at the French Revolution; so with the priestly caste of the Latin Church. When the crash came, and kings and nobles turned against them, the common people as a whole were indifferent or estranged.

But the worst result of this immunity was its influence on the character of the clergy. There is "in fact," as Dr. Poole has well put it, "no surer means towards the degradation of an order than to absolve it from social restraints and to enforce upon it a special code of morals which not all desired to keep, and which many, if not most, found it easy to elude." Exemption from law is not emancipation from infirmity; while undoubtedly the spiritual courts offered facilities of escape, especially for the worst offenders. Whatever the crime of which he was accused, the criminal clerk could be admitted to "compurgation," *i.e.*, allowed to gather a number of other tonsured ruffians to join him in swearing that he had not done the deed. The man was

thereupon discharged, nor could further evidence be offered by the prosecution. *Esprit de corps* thus turned immunity into impunity; while to obtain this benefit crowds of worthless wretches took the lower orders. In spite of herself, the Church was thus driven to protect the vilest of the vile. Matters went so far that in 1317 the priests of Naples succeeded in establishing the immunity of their concubines. Similar instances of arrogance or of unpunished rascality abound, and might be multiplied at large. History endorses the verdict of Luther when in 1521 he arraigned this 'prolific source' of evil: 'hence,' he cries, 'the debaucheries, the adulteries, the fornications, the uncleanness, the avarice, the fraud, the swindling, the universal chaos of crime which reigns everywhere, unpunished, and unchecked by fear of God or man.'

III

Before passing away from the Canon Law there are certain questions which demand an answer. What, it may be asked, was the influence on the development both of the Church and civilisation of this judicial *imperium in imperio*? Our answer, like all broad generalisations, may not be true in every detail. Never-

theless we believe that, broadly considered, the Canon Law was not without its blessing. As Mr. Rashdall rightly observes: "We have to take ourselves back to a state of society in which a judicial trial was a tournament, and the ordeal an approved substitute for evidence, to realise what civilisation owes to the Canon Law and the canonists, with their elaborate system of written law, their judicial evidence, and their written procedure." In spite of all their sins the canonists represent the triumph of mind and order over brute force and superstition.

The effect on the character of the clergy, apart altogether from their immunity to secular justice, was perhaps not so beneficial. In the earlier centuries the danger of the Church lay in the admission into her ministry of rude and ignorant men, the creatures and warriors of kings. In the later ages she became a profession, the entrance into which was by the door of the law. The former danger was more self-evident, more easily repelled than the second. St. Hugh of Lincoln used often to complain that 'the only difference at the present day between magistrates and bishops is that the latter are kept sitting in judgment perpetually, and the former only on certain specified days; the civil judges have some leisure to attend to their domestic affairs,

whereas the ecclesiastical judges have scarcely a moment even to save their souls.’¹ But the din and distraction of sessions was not the worst evil of the system. The hierarchy, necessarily recruited from the canonists, had no ties of sympathy with the great mass of the clergy. “The idea of making a man a bishop or an archdeacon on account of his zeal, his energy, his success in the humble round of parochial duty, is one which would hardly have occurred to sensible men in medieval times.” The result was seen in the degradation of the parish priest, and the exaltation of the episcopacy into a caste apart, whose vested interests, civil entanglements, and legal powers successfully crushed all attempts at reform from within. With his usual instinct Luther saw that the overthrow of this ecclesiastical jurisprudence was a prime necessity if the Church was to be saved from itself. When he threw the Decretals into the flames before the doctors and populace of Wittenberg (December 10, 1520) he claimed more than his civil freedom; he asserted the need of a spiritual priesthood, emancipated from the serving of legal

¹ *St. Hugh of Lincoln*, ed. Thurston, p. 303, an excellent life (R.C.) of a great medieval bishop and saint; a translation (with notes) of a French Carthusian life based on the *Magna Vita* (Rolls’).

tables. The failure to see this was the weakness of Calvin and his Presbyterian system.

There is another department of Church Law the influence of which in the development of papal power should not be overlooked. We refer to the system of penitentials. This great instrument for Christianising barbarian tempers was originally the creation, so it would seem, of the Irish Church, and in special of Columban. Thence through Theodore of Tarsus and the English prelates it passed into the general Church of the West.¹ In condemnation of the principles and methods of the whole system we are all substantially agreed; yet the student should remember the great law illustrated on every page of ecclesiastical history, "that those beliefs or institutions that seem irrational, or absurd, or unworthy of the Christian spirit, have come into vogue in order to kill some deeper evil, not otherwise to have been destroyed."² The

¹ So Haddan, *Scots on the Continent* (*Remains*, p. 267). Also Wasserschleben. For more on the Penitentials, etc., see detached note on Damiani, vol. i. p. 62. For the place of Gregory the Great in the development, see Harnack, *Dogma*, pp. 390-391. For some of the difficulties of Indulgences, see Creighton, *Papacy*, bk. vi. c. 3; Harnack, *op. cit.* 479-485. For the Flagellants and their confraternities, dramas, etc., see *Eng. Hist. Review*, vol. vi.

² Allen, *Christian Institutions*, p. 408.

penitentials were a necessity if the Church was to bring the masses that had nominally passed into the kingdom of Christ, yet remained in many respects heathen at heart, into any real experience of religion. In the early medieval Church, unlike the Church of the first three centuries, baptism came first—oftentimes the baptism of whole races received as they were into the Church of the Empire they had conquered; training and discipline must needs come later.

Penance, to adopt for this system of discipline the familiar title nowadays somewhat restricted in its application, was thus no mere creation of sacerdotalism, but a response to popular needs, the outcome of the revolution produced by the barbarian invasions. In the decaying Roman world no state save the Church was either strong enough or civilised enough to enforce obedience to moral law, or hold down the usages and reminiscences of heathenism. Her punishments were at first limited to those sanctioned by the pains and fears of the wounded conscience. Unfortunately the Church soon yielded to the Teutonic custom of commuting misdeeds by a money payment, or by means of substitutes. Hence the opening of the door to the perils and abuses of indulgences. But that evil was of

later growth, largely in fact an outcome of the Crusades. In the earlier age the chief defect of the system lay in the fact that punishment bore more hardly on the poor than on the rich, while above all it made sin something arbitrary and external to the soul. The priest also who could release from its punishments on earth, or whose prayers had power with God in the mysterious other world of retribution, took the place of the Christ who could purify the heart. The Pope and not the Spirit became the administrator of mercy and pardon. Thus the human race became afraid of dealing directly with God, and sacerdotalism won its long triumph. When Abailard laid down the principle that the essence of sin lay in the motive, his doctrine was condemned. The Church felt that his teaching was a blow at her dominion; it would have brought the sinner into relation with Him unto whom alone all hearts are open. So when Dante at a later date proclaimed in his *Divine Comedy* that hell, purgatory, and heaven correspond to an inward condition of the soul, men heeded not the voice crying in the wilderness.¹ The religious consciousness of Europe had handed over to the successors of St. Peter not only supremacy on earth, but a virtual dominion over the

¹ For Dante's views, see Moore, *op. cit.* 43-58.

vast circles of the unseen world. God the Father was lost in the effort to escape from God the Judge; while the Pope, to whom alone belonged the keys of the treasury of grace,¹ usurped the place of the Eternal Love.

The evils of the whole system of penance have been often exposed, and are sufficiently familiar. The student of ethics will point out with Luthardt the tendency — always natural to the Roman spirit — to stiffen all morality into legal restrictions, and to confound the inner law with the regulations of the Church. Or he may dwell on the bands of Flagellants who in times of popular excitement covered the land, stripped to the waist and plying a scourge knotted with four iron points, the use of which for thirty-three days cleansed the soul from all stains of sin. He may instance the madness of that typical hermit Dominicus Loricatus, who with a broom in each hand and singing psalms, could wipe off, as his friend Damiani relates with pride, a century of guilt within a week. The theologian will point to the constant

¹ The doctrine of the treasure of the Church was first suggested by the English doctor, Alexander of Hales. It is fully dealt with in Lea, *Indulgences*, vol. iii. pp. 14-27. For the slow development of Indulgences until the Jubilee, see *ibid.* 141-145. For the application to the dead, *ibid.* c. 6.

haggling and bargaining over the value of sin and the value of merit, or he may relate the numberless instances of desperate abuse, a chicken or a pint of wine purchasing absolution for the foulest deeds. These evils, the necessary results of a system that experience has demonstrated to be false, should not be minimised; nor should their exaggeration obscure the real inwardness to the medieval mind of the doctrine and its corollaries. As Harnack allows, its first effect was a certain deepening of the conception of sin, though the deepening was counterbalanced in time by the stupefying readiness with which men acknowledged themselves as sinners. Another effect was the formation side by side with the sacramental Christ of the image of the historical Jesus, in the contemplation of whose sufferings Bernard and others found their most passionate exaltation. Through the doctrine of penance men learned that love and suffering were one. In St. Thomas' conception also of the Church's common treasury of merit, out of whose inexhaustible store the Pope could dispense to the spiritually destitute, we see another instance of the great medieval conception so unintelligible to latter-day individualism. In everything "the social aim predominates; the duties of life spring out of our solidarity as a

race"; humanity on earth is one with suffering humanity in the invisible world. But when all has been said that sympathy or charity can suggest, the wonder will still remain; the blindness of men for a thousand years to the many-sided dangers of a complicated system that taxed a trained intelligence to understand or explain. The irreligiousness of the fourteenth century, the commercialism of the fifteenth, and the scepticism of the Renaissance reduced theory and practice alike into a mockery of Christianity.

But the greatest effect of the Canon Law was the subjection thereby of the Church to the dominion of the Papacy. Henceforth the Church was developed on the lines not so much of theology as of jurisprudence. Theoretically Canon Law was the law created by Councils and Synods; in actual practice it was the case-law of the popes. The fine line which divides the declaration of law from the making of law was too subtle for the times. Not only so, but from the days of the False Decretals¹ Rome had obtained universal appellate jurisdiction.

¹ For the *False Decretals*, see vol. i. pp. 252, 38. They take up 1100 pages in Migne (vol. 130). For their origin, in addition to Wasserschleben (Herzog), see Lea, *Studies*, pp. 42-55 (inclines traditional view). The student will find a judicious survey with authorities (Latin) in the prolegomena to Migne by Denzinger and Phillips.

German criticism has taught us to believe that in their emphasis of this right the great forgers had no special wish to aggrandise the Papacy. Their primary object was to secure the freedom of the Frankish bishops from the control of ambitious metropolitans. Better a great pope in the Lateran than little popes at Rheims, Toledo, or Canterbury. An appeal to Rome would secure local liberties, while the Alps and the distance were safeguards against undue papal interference. But the advocates of the Decretals underrated alike the resources of the central authority and the litigiousness of the times. The right of appeal once acknowledged, the popes annihilated distance by their system of legates, of delegated jurisdictions, and of 'impetration.'¹ The endlessness, the costliness, the rancour of the internal quarrels of the medieval Church also played into their hand.

¹ "The plaintiff who went to the Pope for a writ seems to have enjoyed a large liberty of choosing his own judges. In the letter of 'impetration' that he sent to Rome he named the persons whose appointment he desired. The Pope, no doubt, was free to name other delegates in their stead; still we may believe that the plaintiff generally got his way, unless he asked for something outrageous." No wonder that "all great people kept permanent agents in the Court of Rome." See Maitland's remarkable chapter on "The Universal Ordinary." The quarrels of Grosseteste are well told by Stevenson. They should be studied as crucial instances.

To say nothing of the quarrels of the monasteries with one another and with the bishops, of the disputes about primacies whether York or Canterbury should be the greater, every see in Christendom was at constant feud with its Dean and chapter, or with the holder of its temporalities. All such disputes must finally end, and often began, in an appeal to the omnicompetent court at Rome, the "common fatherland" as the canonists called it of all men, the only court in which no obstacle stood in the litigant's way because of the "geographical limits of diocesan justice." Grosseteste himself, the reputed champion of Anglican liberties, is always despatching his proctors, or himself hastening to Rome or Lyons, that he may win his interminable lawsuits. That a quarrel could be settled except by the Curia seemed inconceivable; in fact, in the long run it was always cheapest to carry it at once to the Court of Appeal, and disregard the courts of first instance completely. If you did not, depend upon it your opponent would.

Thus in every parish of Christendom there were courts of law and a system of law, the source and centre of whose authority was the Bishop of Rome. From Scotland to Hungary the Pope's writs, backed as they were by excommunication

and interdicts, contested the supremacy of the Crown. Secular princes might here and there resist the enforcement of some decretal or extravagant, the law of the King's Court might run contrary to the law of the Court Christian, but inability to enforce a right was never acknowledged by Rome as the lapse of that right. She claimed then, as she claims still, that 'it is necessary to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman pontiff.' Of national churches she knew nothing;¹ their authority was nil, their one duty obedience. If a local custom ran contrary to the papal decrees, remission might be humbly implored of the apostolic clemency, but no local custom or synodal constitution could for one moment override the common law of the Church. Christ said not "I am the custom," but "I am the Truth." In spite of the fictions of modern historians, she found in the Church itself but slight resistance to her claims. The cardinal

¹ I might add that in my opinion (following Maitland's epoch-making demonstration) national churches knew nothing of themselves. Their medieval self-consciousness is the exaggeration of later polemics. But I refrain from entering on a question that is the battleground of great parties, and on which too much depends for us to expect dispassionate judgment, at any rate at present. Let the reader master both sides. See "Authorities," §§ 1, 2.

principle of medievalism was the absolute authority of Rome. From the days of Hildebrand until the fatal Babylonish Captivity never was sovereign blessed with more obedient not to say servile subjects. Nor was England an exception to the rule. As Archbishop Peckham of Canterbury told his assembled clergy, 'those whom Peter binds with the chains of his law are bound in the palace of the heavenly Emperor.' Grosseteste himself exhausts his illustrations from optics in showing how the whole of a bishop's power is derived from Jesus Christ by the mediation of our Lord the Pope. He goes on to maintain that the Pope is the master of all the churches of the earth, even of their goods. We need not therefore wonder that when Henry VIII. determined, in the words of Bishop Stubbs, to be "the Pope, the whole Pope, and something more than the Pope" over a new national Church of his own construction, his first care was to close the schools of the Canon Law, and as far as possible get rid of the very memory of its existence. Twice every quarter were the clergy to preach to the people 'that the Bishop of Rome's pretended and usurped power and jurisdiction was of most just causes taken away and abolished.'¹

¹ Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 269. Cf. pp. 251 and 380.

IV

The student who has mastered the principles of our previous pages should have little difficulty in understanding the growth of the Inquisition. To the nineteenth century this institution is the incarnation of spiritual despotism. Even the impartial historian finds a difficulty in so detaching himself from current ideas as to deal fairly with this terrible development. Nevertheless we should endeavour to estimate the Inquisition from the standpoint of the age in which it was established.

We must remember that toleration even as a speculative idea is essentially modern, repugnant to the statecraft and piety of preceding centuries. The growth of the spirit of intolerance in the early Church will be dealt with in its proper place. As theological strife, especially over Arius, grew more bitter Christianity forgot the incongruity between persecution and the gospel. The first result also of Christianity becoming the religion of the Empire was the attempt by Constantine to enforce uniformity. In an imperial Church there can be no right of the sects to separate existence. That is as impossible as the right of the nations to be independent kingdoms. The world - power,

secular or spiritual, must crush all revolt. To its credit be it said the Latin Church was somewhat backward in actual persecution; she lacked alike the passions and heresies of the East. In the profound stupor of the ninth and tenth centuries the persecuting spirit died out. Orthodoxy and heresy were stagnant; the West was absorbed in her struggle for existence with Huns and Normans. The few who disturbed the Church with their deeper questionings—Felix of Urgel with his Adoptionism, and the monk Gottschalk with his predestination—were not severely treated. But in the eleventh century conscience and reason awoke from their long sleep and began to rend the unity of the Church.

At first the Church was slow to resort to extremities; she had forgotten how to use her rusted weapons. Some burnings there were, but they were in all cases the result of lynch law and popular fanaticism. When in 1145 the mob of Cologne burnt the Cathari despite the resistance of the clergy, Bernard pleaded that faith must be spread by persuasion and not by force. But the growth of heresy and the lack of Bernards compelled the Church to resort to her older weapons. Council after Council urged upon the bishops to stamp out error by using their powers of parochial

inquisition. Whether from indolence or humanity, or because, as Gregory IX. put it, 'they were engrossed in the whirlwind of cares and scarce able to breathe in the pressure of overwhelming anxieties,' the bishops were with few exceptions slack in their duty. Oftentimes, too, they were so ignorant of theology that they could not decide whether prisoners were special saints or notorious sinners. Besides this, the skilful heretic could always escape, or at least protract the proceedings indefinitely, by an appeal to Rome. Innocent III. saw that the persecution must be centralised; it must be delivered from the whims and irregularities of the prelates and handed over to the greater zeal and continuity of the Curia.

Thus the founding of the Inquisition was rather change of court and venue than the inauguration of a new policy. But only gradually was the idea conceived by Innocent moulded by his successors into a perfect instrument. In this task they were aided by two new factors. In the children of Dominic and Francis Rome found the men she needed as her international police; men free from local prejudice and interest, dedicated to the conversion of heretics, and whose popularity would cover all sins against liberty. The other

factor was the secular legislation against heresy, which about this time, largely under the influence of the revived Roman Law, took statute form. Nine years before the Inquisition was founded¹ Frederic II. had made the persecution of heresy a part of the public law of Europe (1220), while in 1224 he added the penalty of death by fire. The Church hastened to approve of his legislation and embody it in her Canon Law. The Emperor had given the Papacy a method of dealing with obnoxious heretics as effective as it was convenient. She could avoid all ugly phrases, "coarse talk of

¹ There is no fixed date for the founding of the Inquisition. Lea takes the date of an obscure commission (1227), others the Council of Tarascon (1229), others 1233, when persecution was handed over to the Dominicans. Fixity of machinery was first given by the bull of Innocent IV. (1252), *Ad Extirpanda*. Strictly speaking, the episcopal Inquisition still continued side by side with the papal, and in England, Denmark, Scandinavia, Castile, and Portugal was the only Inquisition. In other countries the adjustment of the two rivals was attended with friction. But in their hunting of heresy the bishops were handicapped by lack of funds. The reader should dismiss the papal fiction (repeated by the recent historian of Dominic, Drane) that Dominic had anything to do with the founding of the Inquisition. For the decree of Frederic, see Döberl, v. § 15. Its classification of heretics is interesting. 'Chataros, Paterenos, Leonistas' (=Lyonistas, *i.e.* Waldenses), 'Speronistas,' (Robert de Sperone was a French Cathar), 'Arnaldistas, Circumcisos.' The whole decree should be studied.

flames and faggots," and hand over her victims in quiet content to the secular arm, salving the while any shreds of conscience or memories of Jesus with unmeaning formulas of mercy.

Let us try to understand the prevailing sentiment. To the people at large heresy was of all crimes the greatest because the most dangerous. The heretic perished not alone in his iniquity. Caiaphas was the prophet of medieval intolerance: it was expedient that one man should burn lest the fires of heaven should overwhelm both city and nation. Better still if the torture of rack and stake could not only avert the vials of wrath, but save the soul of the sinner. For the horrors of hell were ever before the eyes of all, a hell where infants not a span long writhed in eternal flames, while the blessed in heaven found their highest satisfaction in contemplating the miseries of the damned. "All human interests therefore shrank into nothingness in comparison with the one overmastering duty of keeping the flock from straying, and of preventing an infected sheep from communicating his poison to his fellows." To hew Agag in pieces before the Lord was the call of God; to neglect was the ruin of people and king.

Other considerations ministered to intolerance besides this excessive consciousness of solidarity,

or the conviction of kings that the unity of the State rested on the unity of faith. We should not forget that the profits of persecution were considerable, and went chiefly into the royal exchequer. By Roman Law high treason (*majestas*) involved not only death but confiscation, a confiscation which was deemed to have taken place from the moment the crime was conceived. Innocent III. transferred this punishment to heresy, 'since,' said he, 'it is far greater treason to assail spiritual than temporal majesty.' Thus self-interest supplied the fuel for the flames of zeal. The greed of kings needed little stimulus. Where the carcase was there the vultures gathered together and battered on the ruin the Inquisition caused.

"Dominic and Francis, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, Innocent III. and St. Louis were types in their several ways of which humanity in any age might well feel proud"; and yet where heresy was concerned they were ruthless. Said St. Louis, 'Clerks may dispute, but the layman who hears the Christian faith spoken against ought to defend it only with his sword, which he should drive home into the gainsayer.' The student therefore who in his modern hatred of intolerance confounds all in a common anathema shows that he has not

realised the evolution of our present ideals. To the Church of those days, for that matter to all Churches until Oliver Cromwell¹ pointed the way to better things, toleration was a thing unspeakable, a crime against God and truth. Heretics, writes Thomas Aquinas, must not be endured. The tenderness of the Church allows them to have two warnings; after which, if pertinacious, they must be abandoned to the secular power. This, he argues, shows the mercy of the Church, for as it is much more wicked to corrupt the faith on which depends the life of the soul than to debase the coinage which provides merely for temporal life; wherefore if coiners and malefactors are justly doomed at once to death, much more might heretics be slain as soon as they are convicted. So the Church must take care that its charity work not evil to others. In this last sentence we have the key to the policy of intolerance. To the medieval

¹ Toleration as a speculative theory was not new. Its principles are clearly stated by Marsiglio (*Defensor Pacis*, 1327). See also More's *Utopia* and Luther ('thoughts are toll-free'). But in practice More and Luther were utterly intolerant on political grounds. The work of Cromwell was to change an abstract principle into a political expedient. See Masson's *Milton*, iii. 98-127, for sketch of growth of toleration among the Puritans. For Cromwell's share, see iii. 166-171, iv. 570, v. 343-345; also Gardiner.

thinker individualism of thought or religion was a thing impossible; for thought and religion were both questions of society. In their unity men found the basis and bond of continued social existence. Whatever, therefore, tended to destroy this unity was as much a hurt to the State as the work of the thief or coiner. These last exalted individualism into the license of crime; the heretic turned it into the lever for overturning society itself.

The crime of the Inquisition therefore does not consist in a new departure of intolerance and cruelty, nor in its outrage of popular conviction. Its punishments also were merciful in comparison with those which until the present age disgraced the secular codes; while in theory its procedure was hedged round with safeguards of justice. Nevertheless, when every excuse has been made that fairness or leniency may demand, when too the number of its victims has been stripped of popular exaggerations,¹ the Inquisition will for ever stand out as the most infamous invention of the perverted genius of man. We blame it not that in the days of its origin it failed to rise superior to the

¹ See Lea, i. 495, 549-550. Between 1308 and 1322 the famous Bernard Gui dealt with 636 cases. There is not one release; but forty alone were burned. These figures are typical, and should be compared with the wholesale massacres in which the Civil Law revelled.

moral consciousness of Europe. Its damnation lies in its stereotyping of all that was most evil in popular passion, in its fatal crippling of development, its smothering of aspiration, and in the deterioration of all the higher aspects of life of which it proved the fruitful parent.

The iniquity and horror of the Inquisition needs neither proof nor illustration. We cannot realise to-day a state of society which condoned, nay even at first welcomed, its tyranny, placing at its disposal the whole resources of the State. The gigantic structure overshadowed Christendom, terrorising laity and clergy into submission to Rome. Her officers were irresponsible save to the Pope; they could judge all yet be judged by none. Even its familiars, bravoës, and spies were shielded with inviolability. From its unceasing vigilance no heretic could hope for escape; a long arm reached across the seas; a sleepless memory treasured up the records of every heretical family for generations; kindly death brought no release. Half a century may have elapsed since the heretic's decease in the full odour of sanctity, but the sleuth hounds of Rome will at last trace out his crime,¹ burn his bones, con-

¹ See the remarkable story of Armanno Pongiluppo in Lea, *Inquisition*, ii, 240-242.

fiscate the property of his grandchildren, raze his house to the ground, and dedicate it for ever as a public receptacle of filth. Her net was everywhere, and no prey so small that it could elude her meshes. She entered into the home, breaking up the peace of families, holding out rewards to the father that should betray his son, to the wife that would denounce her husband. In one case a lad of ten was allowed to incriminate his father, his sister, and seventy others; while the wretch denounced by the bigotry or malice of her spies knew neither the names nor the evidence of the witnesses against him. Sir John Fortescue, the Chancellor of Henry VI., was right when he declared that the system placed every man's life in the hands of his enemy. As no heretic could convey a legal title or contract a debt, all alienations subsequent to his heresy were void, and fell without redress to the State, no matter through how many hands the property might have passed. Thus business transactions of every kind were subject to the orthodoxy not merely of the living but of the dead. Where the Inquisition flourished industry and commerce were of necessity paralysed, social intercourse threatened, the home destroyed.

Safeguards, it is true, existed on paper; in practice the unfortunate wrestling for his life

was at the mercy of the inquisitor and his creatures. Acquittal was unknown; the case might drag on in absence of evidence for thirty years; but sooner or later the spirit would be crushed and a confession wrung. Better were it that the innocent should rot in his dungeon than one guilty man escape. So suspicion was accepted as proof, and every doubtful point decided "in favour of the faith." Counsel and means of defence there was none; to defend a heretic was itself heresy. By a legal fiction the inquisitor took care of the interests of the accused. No falsehood was too false, no evidence too tainted, no trick too base for the calm systematic torture of body and soul by which Rome strove to wring from the accused confession against himself and the denunciation of others. Every species of deceit was sanctified if profitable for conviction. As Innocent III. emphatically put it, 'faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not faith with God.' The ripe fruit of this doctrine will be seen in the case of Hus.

Two crimes in special must be laid at her door. Until the Inquisition torture was unknown to jurisprudence. In the darkest centuries the Church condemned its use; in 1215 the Lateran Council had rid Europe of the sister scourge of ordeals. But in 1252 Inno-

cent IV. made torture legal for the hunting of heretics, and forced its use on the secular courts. Not the least of the many crimes of the Inquisition, the most abiding perhaps in its results, was the way in which she thus poisoned for centuries the administration of justice and the methods of evidence. Henceforth on the Continent a prisoner was held guilty until he could prove his innocence.

In her influence on the rising judicial system of Europe the Inquisition sinned against civilisation. In her studied hypocrisy she sinned against the Holy Ghost. Her cruelty we could forgive ; that was characteristic of the age. Nor should we object that she claimed the blessing of Heaven on the deeds of hell ; fanatics in every age have done the same. But her systematic self-deceit is her unpardonable sin. By the law of the Church the cleric who took part in torture or bloodshed was rendered unfit for his sacred duties. So inquisitors were instructed to absolve each other, while all sentences of 'relaxation' were delivered in the open air. By her law torture could only be administered once ; her agents tricked the canons by the device of successive 'adjournments.' When at last relentless cruelty had extorted confession, the mangled victim was carried into another room, his ravings

read aloud, the oath administered, and careful record entered that 'the confession was free and spontaneous, made without the pressure of force or fear.' In her sentences we have the same hopeless insult of truth. The heretic condemned to lifelong imprisonment is enjoined to 'betake himself to such and such a cell and live out there his penance of bread and water.' If he broke jail and escaped, the requisition for his recapture described him as one 'insanely led to reject the salutary medicine offered for his cure, and to spurn the oil and wine which were soothing his wounds.' When handed over, 'relaxed' as it was called, to the secular judgment, the State was solemnly admonished that the punishment to be inflicted 'should not imperil life or limb or cause effusion of blood.' But woe to the secular prince that took the Church at her word!¹ In the Middle Ages the Inquisition wrapped herself round with deceit and fear; to-day she stands self-revealed in all the horrors of a system whose cruelty pagan tyrants might have emulated, but whose resources of hypocrisy they would have envied in vain.

¹ Lea, i. 536-540, disposes of the modern R.C. fiction that the Church was not responsible for the burnings. Such a doctrine would have astonished the Innocents. See Maitland, *op. cit.* c. 6, *The Deacon and the Jewess*, for a test case.

PART V

THE CONTINUITY OF LIFE

CHAPTER V

DARKNESS AND DAWN

*In shepherds' clothing greedy wolves below
Range wide o'er all the pastures. Arm of God!
Why longer sleepest thou?*

PAR., xxvii. 51-52.

*When men are cast down, then thou shalt say, There is
lifting up; and the light shall shine upon thy ways.*

JOB xxii. 28, 29.

AUTHORITIES.—§ 1. For the general picture here presented I can refer to no special source. But the reader will find some indications in the notes. For gloomy and somewhat exaggerated descriptions, see LEA, *Inquis.*, i. c. 1; SABATIER, *St. F.*, c. 3. For the origin of vicarages, see PEGGE, *Grosseteste* (1793), App. vi.; STEVENSON, *Grosseteste*, c. vi. and pp. 279-290; and THURSTON, *St. Hugh*, pp. 314-320.

§ 2. For the heresies, LEA, *op. cit.* i. cc. 2, 3, and of the older historians, NEANDER. For the relation of Paulicians and Bogomils to the Cathari, GIBBON, vi. c. 54, with BURY'S App. 6. Bury follows CONYBEARE, *Key of Truth*, but the question seems in a more unsettled state than he assumes. For the Waldenses, the older authorities (*e.g.* Monastier, Muston) are misleading. (See note, p. 189.) I have used COMBA, *The Waldenses of Italy* (accurate, confused), and BRUNEL, *Les Vaudois des Alpes Françaises* (good chronological skeleton of information).

§ 3. For the Mystics, VAUGHAN, *Hours, etc.* (unsympathetic; too much "walnuts and wine"). Better the new INGE, *Christian Mysticism* (Lectures, 1-4). See also RENAN, *New Studies* (c. *A Monastic Idyl*). For Joachim and the Eternal Gospel, see RENAN, *op. cit.* (a learned study). For Dionysius, see vol. i. p. 222, n., and add SEEBOHM, *Oxford Reformers*, pp. 60-78. For the Military Orders, FROUDE, *Short Studies*, or the tediously-drawn-out PORTER, *The Knights of Malta* (2 vols.), and JACQUES DE VITRY, *Jerusalem*, trans. Stewart, pp. 46-56.

DARKNESS AND DAWN

I

AT the close of the twelfth century the Latin Church was approaching a crisis in her career. To the casual observer she might seem the mistress of Christendom. The dreams of Hildebrand had been turned into facts. The Empire and the new kingdoms were alike at the feet of the Vicar of Christ. Monarchs like John received their realms as fiefs of Peter. In an age when might was right papal thunders had proved more potent than brute force. Over soul and body alike the empire of Rome seemed complete; nevertheless at no time was the Church nearer disaster than in this hour of her apparent triumph.

The peril of the Church lay within. The priesthood had achieved its supremacy, but the price it had paid had been the loss of its hold upon the religious and moral feelings of the age. The great reformation of Hildebrand had exhausted itself in a struggle for power and

wealth. The men who can safely be entrusted with autocratic power are few, whilst of all autocracy the spiritual is the most fatal. Its dangers arise from its effects upon the priest himself. As Dr. Fairbairn has pointed out, it is a curious but universal fact in religious history that "the higher the claims and the more inalienable the priesthood the lower falls the priest; as the emphasis passes from character to office the man loses in dignity, in the sense and ideal of duty; and he who ought to be the conscience and mind of society becomes its byword and reproach."¹ The gifts and graces of the Spirit give place to ethical feudalism; lowliness and love are supplanted by arrogance and selfishness.

Even angels would have been tempted to leave their first estate if they had found themselves endowed with the powers and privileges of the priesthood at the close of the twelfth century. The destiny of all men lay in their hands; they could administer or withhold the sacraments on which alone depended salvation. Armed with this tremendous weapon, 'the least of the priestly order,' as one of their own writers asserts, was if not 'worthier' at any rate 'mightier than any king.' The sacerdotal caste was not only indispensable; it was irresponsible. The

¹ *Contemporary Review*, September 1899.

monarch must bow before the power of the keys, but the priest was a class apart. No matter what crimes he might commit, the King's justice could not take cognisance of them, the King's officials could not arrest him. But though himself judged of no man he yet judged all. His person and his estates were alike inviolable. All questions of faith and discipline, all matters of marriage, inheritance, and discipline, could only be settled in his courts; few indeed were the cases between man and man in which he could not find some cause for interference. Even the agreements of the market-place were ratified by oaths, and every oath subjected the swearer to the jurisdiction of the keepers of the conscience.

Equally fatal to the Church was its enormous wealth. In the twelfth century wealth brought with it scarcely a thought beyond selfish enjoyment. The wealthy man abused his power in his lifetime as he listed, while he tried to cheat the nakedness of death by leaving a portion of his goods as spiritual endowment for the world to come. When the dying baron bequeathed his broad acres to the Church, the welfare of the surrounding masses or the stewardship of riches was rarely the last thought in his mind. His one concern was the salvation of his own soul. In all ages it is hard for the rich man

to enter into the Kingdom, but the needle's eye is especially difficult for the wealthy priest. For the curse of wealth is its growing lust for more; thus the salvation of souls becomes secondary to the full coffers. So from hedge-priest to prelate the priesthood became filled with

such as for their bellies' sake
Creep and intrude and climb into the fold,

whose only care was "how to scramble at the shearers' feast." No wonder that to the reformers of the time the hope of the Church lay in a return to evangelical poverty, not the professed poverty of the wealthy monastery but the real poverty of Him who had not where to lay His head.

The moral degradation of the secular priesthood was the appalling though inevitable result of its stupendous claims and privileges. Said St. Bernard, 'It is no longer true that the priests are as bad as the people, for the priests are worse than the people.' But especially had the evil eaten out the life of the hierarchy. 'I can believe all things,' writes Cæsar Heisterbach, 'but I cannot believe that any bishop of Germany can possibly be saved.' The records of the times are full of the flagrant crimes of the princes of the Church. Leaving out of account their pride

and lusts, the details of which would be incredible were they not confirmed by the testimony of their own order, their lesser sins had hopelessly estranged from them the respect of their flocks. 'They are more concerned,' writes Heisterbach, 'over the pay of their soldiers than the salvation of their flocks.' They turned their judicial functions into instruments for wringing from the people the uttermost farthing. They heaped up popular hate by buying doubtful claims, and then wearying out their adversaries in courts where they were prosecutor and judge. Even licentiousness paid its tribute known as cullagium, while from excommunications and indulgences they reaped an ample harvest. The wantonness of their despotism might seem deliberately to drive Christendom into insurrection. From one end of Europe to another they were held up to ridicule in popular ballads without number, ballads sung without doubt in the wine-shops kept by the chapters of many cathedrals within the sacred precincts. In the *Goliath* of Walter de Map "picture after picture strips the veil from the corruption of the medieval Church, its indolence, its thirst for gain, its secret immorality. The whole body of the clergy from Pope to hedge-priest is painted as busy in the chase for gain; what escapes

the bishop is snatched up by the archdeacon, what escapes the archdeacon is nosed and hunted down by the dean, while a host of minor officials prowl hungrily around these greater marauders. Out of the crowd of pictures which fills the canvas of the satirist, pluralist vicars, abbots 'purple as their wines,' monks feeding and chattering together like parrots in the refectory, rises the Philistine Bishop, light of purpose, void of conscience, lost in sensuality, drunken, unchaste, the Goliath who sums up the enormities of all. Powerless to hold the wine-cup, Goliath trolls out the famous drinking song that a hundred translations have made familiar to us:—

Die I must, but let me die drinking in an inn!
 Hold the wine-cup to my lips sparkling from the bin!
 So, when angels flutter down to take me from my sin,
 'Ah, God have mercy on this sot,' the cherubs will begin.¹

'You advise me,' replied Richard of England to the exhortations of Fulk of Neuilly, 'to dismiss my three daughters, pride, avarice, and

¹ Green, p. 116. Cf. the songs of Walter von der Vogelweide (Lea, *op. cit.* pp. 54-57). For the *Goliath* and the ballad-makers, see T. Wright, *Latin Poems of W. Map* (preface), and the dainty J. A. Symonds, *Wine, Women, and Song*, espec. pp. 20-23. The ascription to Walter Map first occurs in a MS. of the fourteenth century. In reality the *Confession of Goliath* (translated pp. 55-62) was clearly written at Pavia (cf. p. 54).

incontinence. I bequeath them to the most deserving; my pride to the knight-templars, my avarice to the monks of Citeaux, and my incontinence to the prelates.’¹

The beneficed clergy were like unto their lords, a result which will not surprise us when we remember that livings were openly sold by the bishops, sometimes even to lads under ten. Spiritual fitness was the last qualification considered; while pluralities, with all their attendant evils, were habitual. The Canon Law by which they were forbidden seemed only introduced that it might further the sale of dispensations by the Roman Curia. A conscience over this matter was yet to form. Even Grosseteste, our uncanonised saint, ‘illustrious for holiness of life, like the morning star discerned through a gap in the clouds,’² Grosseteste, ‘the open confutor of both Pope and King, the corrector of monks, the director of priests, the instructor of clerks, the persecutor of the incontinent, the unwearied student of the Scriptures, the hammer of the Romans,’ was yet for the greater part of his life a noted pluralist.

¹ *Spec. Eccles.*, p. 54. See note, p. 175 *infra*.

² So Ed. i. in his unsuccessful appeal to Rome for Grosseteste’s canonisation. The other description is from Matthew of Paris, who had no great reason to love Grosseteste.

If the hierarchy was corrupted by wealth and pluralism, grinding poverty was the curse of the rank and file. This was chiefly the result of the "appropriation" of livings and tithes by religious houses. Of all the sins of monasticism the most mischievous and lasting was their shameless robbery of the seculars. The great abbeys were built up on the legal plunder of "parsons"; every "vicarage" represents the spoliation by monks of the parish priest. By the end of the twelfth century two-thirds of the churches in England had passed into the possession of the regulars. The rectories were sold, the tithes appropriated, and the "vicar" whom the monks put in to do duty in their place was left to starve on the voluntary offerings of the parishioners. The effect of this on the character of the "curates," and the well-being of the Church, needs no illustration. When, for instance, "Richard de Marisco, one of King John's profligate councillors, who was eventually foisted into the see of Durham, gave the Abbey of St. Albans the tithes of Eglingham in Northumberland to help them to make their ale better—'taking compassion upon the weakness of the convent's drink,'"¹ the small beer of the monks might be improved, but at the

¹ Jessopp, *Daily Life in a Medieval Monastery*.

expense of the welfare of the parish. The "vicar" of Eglingham would be the mere servant of a distant monastery, liable to instant dismissal if he championed the cause of the parishioners against the "appropriators" of the tithes, his stipend screwed down to the lowest point consistent with keeping body and soul together. At a later date 'five marks a year,' with the value of the house, if any, deducted, was considered ample pay for a "vicar." Even making all allowance for the increased value of money the sum was ridiculously insufficient. Men of education and character could not be expected to enter the ranks of a Church whose average priest was paid less than the farm-labourer.¹ So the regular clergy thrived apace, while the seculars became more poor and degraded. At a later date the keen eye of Grosseteste saw the evils of the whole system. By his constant opposition to new "appropriations," by his insistence on adequate financial arrangements and the establishment of "vicarages," by his efforts to make the "vicars" independent of the "appropriators" and give them fixity of tenure,

¹ Five marks = £3, 6s. 8d. An agricultural labourer with a wife and two children would earn about £4 a year. See Rogers, *Work and Wages*, p. 170. But the mark should probably be reckoned higher. See *supra*, p. 103, n.

he earned in a good cause the hostility of the monks, more especially of those who were not alive to their duties, who ground the face of the parish that they might make a larger nett revenue for themselves, or even obtained papal letters exempting them from all responsibilities.

But we are anticipating. The discernment of the disease and attempts at a remedy belong to a later generation; at the end of the twelfth century men only saw the evil effects. The secular clergy, corrupted by immoderate wealth, or the hirelings of absentee 'appropriators,' were inefficient when not dissolute; too often they were both. Their mechanical duties performed—preaching of course was out of the question—the priest without a vicarage would take refuge in the tavern, be the leader of the hinds in their 'scotales' or drinking bouts, while for a trifle he would allow the stones of the 'super-altars to be taken out and used for grinding colours.' Happy the parish where things were not worse, where a pluralist "vicar" did not seek to eke out his starvation wages by in turn letting out one of his cures to another even more degraded and inefficient than himself. "Rectors" or "parsons"¹ had become rarities

¹ It is hardly necessary to explain that a "vicar" is a "substitute." The "parson" is the *persona ecclesiae*, and as

in the land. With few exceptions they put the living out to be farmed by a monastery, who in their turn must make a profit out of the transaction.

If we turn to the monastery we shall find a condition of things that was far from satisfactory. The monastic orders, no doubt, were less demoralised than the secular clergy. They had hardly as yet outlived the great reforms of Norbert and Bernard. They could still produce men of whom the Church will ever be proud, men like our own Hugh of Lincoln, "to my mind," writes Ruskin in his *Praeterita* (iii. 1), "in his relations with Henry II. and Cœur de Lion, the most beautiful sacerdotal figure in history. The great pontiffs have a power which

such the holder of the original benefice. A "vicar choral" was the "substitute" of the canon in singing the divine office. "Appropriations" must also be distinguished from the "impropriations" of tithes by laymen common in France and Italy. The whole subject of "vicars," etc., has recently received due attention. See "Authorities," p. 162. Reform was begun before Grosseteste. The predecessor of Grosseteste in the see of Lincoln, Bishop Hugh Wells (1209-1235), who established over three hundred vicarages, has usually, though incorrectly, had the credit assigned of first "rescuing from monkish greed and selfishness a portion of the tithes of the churches which by one method or another the religious had appropriated" (Canon Perry, in Preface to *Liber. Antiq. Hugonis Wells*, ed. Gibbons).

in its strength can scarcely be used without cruelty, nor in its scope without error; the great saints are always in some degree incredible or unintelligible; but Hugo's power is in his own personal courage and justice only; and his sanctity as clear, frank, and playful as the waves of his own Chartreuse well."

Nevertheless, there is truth as well as exaggeration in the testimony of Gilbert of Gemblours (1190) when he confesses that 'monachism had become an oppression and a scandal, a hissing and reproach to all men.' But we should be careful to discern in what the scandal and hissing consisted. For in some respects the latter part of the twelfth century was "the golden age of monasticism." Five hundred and sixty religious houses in England alone, thousands on the Continent, testified to the wealth and splendour of the Benedictine Order and its offshoots. Their estates were the best cultivated in the land, their tenants the most prosperous. A revenue estimated at one-third of the knights' fees of England passed into their treasury. On the whole they used their wealth for no ignoble purpose. Eating and drinking it is true, especially eating, was the monk's great break in monotony. Even Abbot Samson was anxious 'above all things that there be no shabbiness in

the matter of meat and drink.' 'Shabbiness' in these 'matters' was rare, though of real gluttony and drunkenness we hear but little. Black sheep and bad monasteries could of course be found everywhere, but, broadly speaking, vice¹ was not common. No doubt the monks were often unruly, and grumblers always, while the lazy gave our Samson much trouble, open mutiny even in spite of excommunications and foot-shackles. Lax, too, at times in their accounts, "thirty-three official seals" and "loads of bonds" at Bury St. Edmunds testifying to the "bottomless confusion of convent finance." Nevertheless, the monasteries were still centres of culture and wholesome influence. In their scriptoria were written the annals of the times. Their schools provided free education,

¹ Ample details of immorality will be found in Lea's *Celibacy*. But the student should beware. However correct, such a narrative becomes exaggerated by being isolated. No institution can be judged by its failures; no apostles by their Judas; no Church by its dregs. The records of the police court are too often exalted by historians into sweeping generalities. See on this an excellent note in Hardwick's *Christian Church*, p. 242. Note also that the original source of most nasty tales is the *Speculum Ecclesiae Giralardi Cambrensis* (Rolls'). For its value, see the able preface by Brewer. Gerald was grown old, out of favour, and soured. Note also that his enormities chiefly occur in Wales, *i.e.* in out-of-the-way places, where no check of public opinion.

their hospitals welcome and relief for the wayfarer and the sick. In the great famine of 1197, though our monastery was still young and poor, did not our Abbot Gebhardt of Heisterbach feed fifteen hundred people a day, while our mother-house at Hemmenrode was even more liberal?

The sin of monasticism at the end of the twelfth century lay elsewhere. "One of the things that strikes us most, throughout, in Jocelin's *Chronicle*, and indeed in Eadmer's *Anselm*, and other old monastic books, written evidently by pious men, is this, that there is almost no mention of 'personal religion' in them; that the whole gist of their thinking and speculation seems to be the 'privileges of our order,' 'strict exaction of our dues,' 'God's honour' (meaning the honour of our Saint), and so forth." Carlyle's generalisation¹ is somewhat too sweeping; he had forgotten the mystics. Yet he lays his finger on the great weakness and sin;—not so much what the monk did as what he left undone. The monk had forgotten his first love. The rude cell of his founder had become a home of what Dr. Johnson would have called "very clubbable men," with much com-

¹ *Abbot Samson*. A delightful paraphrase of the *Chronicle* of Jocelin, which students should compare with the original (Rolls').

petition among the local gentry for the privilege of entering its walls. What with our manors, our farms, our gardens, the yearly catch by our tenants of "four thousand eels in the marsh-pools of Lakenheath," whose sheep too must "fold nightly in our pens for the manure's sake," to say nothing of our water-dues, and mill-dues, and market-dues, our "reaping-silver," or "penny which every householder is by law bound to pay for cutting down the convent grain," what with all our other privileges and rights, for which, alas! we must sometimes fight with the sons of Belial, our monastery has become altogether too attractive. Our monks dwell at their ease in Zion, conscious doubtless that they have a soul to save, selfishly unconscious of the souls around them. Monasticism had outlived its call; it still survived, respected and wealthy, doing good too in a certain patronising fashion, but the spirit and life was lost, the ideal obscured.

II

The corruption was universal, but it was in the city that its effects were most felt. The twelfth century had witnessed a remarkable growth in the power and population of the towns, especially of Italy and the south of France. With the revival of security there had

arisen a new commerce, while the Crusades, by opening out the Eastern markets, had contributed in no small degree to the growth of City and Guild. Feudalism, in fact, was breaking down. The wars of the Cross had overwhelmed the nobility in debt; on both sides of the Alps the communal movement was shaking the absolutism of State and Church. With this rapid growth of urban population the Church seemed unable to cope. Her machinery was still chiefly rural. In the towns the old parishes had not been divided to meet the new needs, while the great monastic reforms had passed them by. In the development of the ideal of the monk the country had become studded with stately monasteries, but it would be difficult to point to many that were founded within cities themselves, save in such exceptional places as Rome or Milan. True, Paris, London, and other large towns were surrounded with a ring fence of monastic foundations, each girt in by massive wall and moat, but the monk of Westminster or Geneviève cared little or nothing for the spiritual interests of the swarming populations of the adjoining city. When not fighting with them for his rights, or fleecing them by his superior skill in forging deeds, he was too often unconcerned whether they lived or died. His business was to flee

the world, not to save it; so to gain his own soul he abandoned the growing populations to their fate. Of the spiritual destitution of the larger cities we can form but little conception. Antwerp, for instance, was already a centre of commerce for the Netherlands, its population large, its citizens wealthy; but in 1115 it possessed but one church and one priest, and he living in incest. Little wonder that Antwerp was swept away by the heresy of Tanchelm.¹ Three thousand armed men obeyed the demagogue's summons, while the people drank of the water in which he had bathed.

Even with additional churches and a more spiritual clergy the Church would have found difficulty in coping with the rising tide of heresy and misery. By various channels, chiefly the Crusades, the commercial cities of Italy and Southern France had become impregnated with Oriental habits and tastes. Their argosies brought back not only the silks and spices of the East, but also its modes of thought, its moral and physical diseases. Leprosy, hitherto rare, became an awful and universal plague. But it was in the crowded cities, with their indescribable sanitary conditions, that the dreaded

¹ See vol. i. p. 235. Tanchelm (1108-1115) was killed in a boat by a priest. See Lea, *op. cit.* i. 64, 65.

disease claimed its most numerous victims. Once a leper always a leper; science knew no cure, and social economy had no hope. Like pauperism, leprosy was made penal. The leper was the object of vengeance from God, of fear and loathing by men. A form of burial service was read over him ere he was driven out from the gates, cityless, houseless, even excommunicate save for such glimpses of the Sacrament as he could obtain through the leper-hole of some merciful church.¹ They haunted the uncleanly suburbs of the cities, dragging out existence on the alms of the charitable, until kind death claimed them for his own. Then, unhouseled and unaneled, they passed into the great darkness.

Not less to be dreaded were the diseases of the soul. In the cities of the South the doctrines of Eastern Manichæanism were advancing with a rapidity and fascination not easily understood. Petrobusians, Henricians, Waldenses, Stedingers, and other anti-sacerdotal sects² were only a danger to a dominant hierarchy, but the Cathari were a menace to Christianity itself. Catharism

¹ I should like to know the date of these leper-holes. Were they in existence before the time of St. Francis, or are they one result of his revival? The question is one for the antiquarian, and may, for all I know, have been settled.

² Lea is very full on the minor sects; a careful summary of their tenets will be found in Kurtz or Moeller, pp. 382-402.

was in its origin the child of the East. Of few heresies can the continuity of existence under diverse names be more clearly traced. No sect had given more trouble to the Eastern Church than the Paulicians, who derived their name from one of their leaders, Paul of Samosata (660), though really a revival of the old doctrine of Adoptionism.¹ After repeated persecutions the Paulicians were driven to the mountains of Armenia, whence they still carried on their struggle with the orthodox Empire. Efforts to exterminate them were fruitless, while if left in the East they would prove dangerous allies of the Saracens. So, in 973, John Zimisces tried the experiment of toleration, and transported a great colony to Thrace, thus introducing their doctrine

¹ This at any rate is the view of Conybeare. Others would hold that the Paulicians were Marcionites. We know that Adoptionism survived in Spain until the eighth and ninth centuries. "This fact suggests the conjecture that it also lingered on in South France, so that the heresy of the Cathars and Albigenses would not have been a mere imported Bogomilism, but an ancient local survival" (Bury, *op. cit.* p. 543). The student should note that Catharism never had any hold except in districts that had succumbed to Arianism, of which in fact it was a sort of latter-day revival or survival. The derivation of Paulician given above is not certain. See Bury, *Gibbon*, vi. p. 112, n. 5, 6. For Bogomils, n. 32, p. 122, also p. 542. Also Finlay, iii. 67, *sq.* For the different names of the Cathari, see Lea, i. 114, 115.

into Europe. Judged by its future results no step was more disastrous. They multiplied rapidly, and by means of the Pilgrimages and Crusades, more also through their incessant propaganda, they soon spread everywhere in the West. Under the various names of Bogomils, Bulgarians, or Bougres,—a name innocent and national in origin, odious in application,—Patarins, Albigensians, and Cathari, we may discern a heresy almost as united and widespread as the Catholic faith.

The Cathari, or Puritans, owed their name to their high morality. There was, in fact, nothing in their joyless Manichæan creed to attract the sensual. Their first tenet was the familiar position of Gnosticism: matter was the handiwork and stronghold of Satan. Thus they reduced the Incarnation to an illusion, Jesus of Nazareth to a phantasm. The Divine Man who could be touched with a feeling for human infirmities was a contradiction in ideas. His mission had not been to raise our nature but to annihilate it: His gospel not the glad tidings of redemption but the call to warfare with all forms of the seen. As their ideal of spiritual growth lay in the destruction of the flesh, the propagation of life in any form was the work of the Devil. So they refused to eat meat, eggs,

milk, everything in fact which resulted from the sexual passion, with the exception of fish, for which their rude science suggested a different origin. Their fasts were endless, three days in each week, three periods of forty days in each year. Their strict vegetarianism had, however, other roots than their hatred of generation. We have records of Cathari who chose death rather than kill a fowl; to them it was the spirit of a fallen brother passing through another probation. But their tenderness for life was confined to animals. They tortured themselves by swallowing pounded glass or poisonous potions; while suicide was held up as the crowning virtue of "the perfected."

In their ritual and organisation the Cathari imitated the machinery of the Church. They were regularly organised in dioceses, with schools, pastors, and missionaries. Their hierarchy was selected from among "the perfected," and divided into the four orders of the Bishop, the Filius Major, the Filius Minor, and the Deacon. Their Eucharist was apostolic in its simplicity, the daily breaking and distribution of bread. But their great Sacrament, generally postponed until death, was the Consolamentum or Baptism of the Holy Ghost,—in this we see the influence of Adoptionism,—when the soul by the imposition

of hands was reunited to the Spirit and absolved from all sin. The wearing of a sacred thread and shirt, usages which can be traced back to prehistoric Aryan customs, was obligatory also upon all believers.

In matters of morality the orthodox admitted, to their shame, the superiority of the Cathari. 'I am not a heretic,' said a native of Toulouse when dragged before the Inquisition, 'for I eat flesh and lie and swear.' He added other proofs which decency compels us to omit; so his defence was deemed complete. To the same effect is the testimony of St. Bernard: 'The heretic cheats no one, oppresses no one, strikes no one; his cheeks are pale with fasting, he eats not the bread of idleness.' But the purity of their lives must not mislead us into false sympathy with their creed, whose poison was thereby rendered the more subtle and persuasive. Catharism struck at the very roots of the Christian faith. A dominant Catharism would have been as disastrous to civilisation as to religion. By their indiscriminating condemnation of all nature, as well as by their destruction of the family, they must in time have led man back to his prehistoric savagery. When they proclaimed that the Virgin was both ugly and one-eyed they did more than mock at a mischievous Mariolatry;

they struck a blow at the instinct for beauty and the sources of art. There was little either of the human or divine about a creed the first tenet of which strove to get rid of the Son of Man, and to confound the Creator with the Devil. So evident is their heresy, so joyless their belief, that we may well wonder how this extravagant hybrid of purity and falsehood threatened for a while by its rapid development the very existence of Christianity.

In the spread of Catharism there are three points which the student should note. He will mark the difference between the heresies of the Middle Ages and those which disturbed the early Church. The dogmas of Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches were speculative and theological; we might almost say that they were instruments used by God for the gradual evolution of the Catholic doctrine. As iron sharpeneth iron so the conflicts of a faith struggling to be articulate wrought out our creeds. But the heresies of the thirteenth century were heresies of the market - place. The votaries of Catharism, except in Languedoc, were peasants and weavers (*Tisserands*), who chose rather to suffer the worst agonies of death than be turned from their gloomy and dangerous superstitions. Leaders they had none save men as rude of

all learning as themselves. So the blind led the blind, and both alike fell into the ditch.

The reader will further note that their chief strength lay in Languedoc, at that time the richest realm in Christendom. But in the south of France an irreligious chivalry had become the religion of the upper classes, the saint had been superseded by the mistress, the Psalms of David supplanted by the licentious erotics of the Troubadours, the confessional ousted by the foolish casuistry of the Courts of Love. Like the modern butterflies the gilded classes were prepared to embrace any heresy that would provide a new sensation for their jaded existence. In all ages it has been the same. The gospel of work is a necessary part of the gospel of love; the forgetting the Carpenter of Nazareth ends in the denial of the Lord and Giver of Life.

The third reason for the success of the Cathari lay in the prevailing fetichism of religious life, especially among the lower classes. The means of grace, the sacraments, the relics of saints, even prayer itself, had become fetiches, with a power of their own entirely independent of spiritual conditions, self-acting magic formulæ which needed no aid of faith. One of the strangest books of the Middle Ages is the *Dialogus*

Miraculorum of Cæsar of Heisterbach,¹ a work compiled while Francis was calling Europe to a new life. The reader of this little book will find himself transported into the very heart of popular religious life as it existed in Rhineland seven hundred years ago. He will feel its moral earnestness and deep spiritual convictions; he will realise the gulf that separates the past from the present; he will marvel at the darkness of the age and the unconsciousness of that darkness. But most of all will he be amazed at the prevailing fetichism, to Cæsar evidently the glory of the times. We read, for instance (i. 62), of a certain apostate monk who died outside his order and was buried in the dress of the secular clergy, but when the grave was opened he was found with the tonsure and habit of the Cistercian, a miracle due to his deathbed contrition, and the 'ineffable pity of our Saviour.' Cæsar's exaltation of the power of repentance perhaps saves the tale from rank fetichism, but the same allowance cannot be made for others. Cæsar tells of a parrot carried off by a kite, who cried out in his peril "Holy Thomas of Canterbury, help me!" and immediately the kite fell dead to the ground (ii. 255); of a woman who when

¹ Ed. Strange (Cologne, 2 vols.); a convenient and inexpensive reprint which the student should possess.

her bees were stricken with disease placed 'the body of the Lord' in the hive; the bees recognising in the wafer their Creator, built round it a complete 'little chapel,' with 'windows, campanile, gateway, and altar' (ii. 172); of 'Albigensians who walked on the waters and were not drowned,' until a certain priest threw the wafer into the river (ii. 175); of a merchant of Groningen who with the help of a harlot stole the arm of the Baptist, and whose house alone was saved when his city was burnt to the ground (ii. 125). But perhaps the most amazing instance of the current fetichism is the narrative of a twelfth-century chronicler, who relates how in 887 the body of St. Martin had been secretly transported to Auxerre that it might be saved from the Danes. When the terror was past, the monks brought it back to Tours. Two cripples hearing of the approach of the holy bones were seized with terror lest St. Martin should rob them of their lucrative impotence. They hobbled off as fast as they could, but unfortunately the corpse arrived in Touraine before they could cross the frontiers of the province; so they were healed in spite of all efforts to escape. Such tales might be multiplied in thousands. They are not the efforts of the nursery, but the grave productions of learned men. Little wonder that

the Cathari swept Europe from end to end. By their exaltation of religion as an inner condition, however mistaken their new creed, they rallied to their cause all rebels against the degrading fetichism of the age. But the Albigenses were inarticulate, ignorant, and gloomy; it was reserved for Francis to point out the more excellent way of sunshine and love.

Very different in character to the Cathari was the sect, if sect it should be called, that owed birth and name to Peter Waldo, a merchant of Lyons.¹ One day on his way to mass Waldo heard a singer reciting a popular ballad—how Alexis, a wealthy young man of Rome, had turned his back on his bride at the marriage altar that he might take the vow of poverty. The story troubled his soul, already awakened, like Luther, by the sudden death of a friend. In his despair he sought out one of the canons of the cathedral, a learned man, “who knew as many roads to heaven as Waldo had travelled in attending his different markets.” The merchant was puzzled. At last he said, ‘Of all the roads which is the

¹ The origin of the Waldenses and the meaning of the name has given rise to much controversy. The view that they have descended from the ancient Church through Claudius of Turin (i. 234, n.) must be abandoned. Unfortunately it vitiates some of the earlier works on the Waldenses, *e.g.* Muston, Monastier.

surest? I desire to follow the perfect way.' 'Ah!' answered the canon, 'that being the case, here is Christ's precept: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."' Waldo gave away his goods, then set himself to the study of the Gospels. These he persuaded two priests to translate into the dialect of the country. Soon he was joined by others. With sandals on their feet—hence their name of *sabatati* (*sabot*)—and robed in a peculiar dress, they went everywhere, preaching the gospel to the poor. When stopped by the Archbishop of Lyons, Waldo appealed to Rome (1179), hoping to gain from Alexander III. and the Third Lateran Council a permission similar to that which at a later date Dominic and Francis obtained from Innocent. Walter de Map, who was present at the Council as the delegate of Edward II., has given us an account of the interview:—

I saw in the Council some Waldenses, ignorant and unmannered people, called by the name of Waldo their chief. They presented to the Pope a book written in the dialect of Gaul, containing the Psalms together with several portions of the Old and New Testaments. These people insisted that their right to preach should be recognised. They considered themselves worthy; as a matter of fact they were nothing but fools. I, poor wretch, who felt myself remarkably small in such an imposing assembly, could not help thinking it ridiculous that

their request should be seriously considered, and that it took so long to arrive at a decision. . . . They pretended to be guides and were themselves in want of guides. Without fixed abode, they go about in pairs, barefooted, with woollen tunic, possessing nothing, like the apostles. Naked, they follow a naked Christ. . . . Had we suffered them to gain admittance we should have been driven out ourselves.

The views of de Map prevailed; permission was refused. "We must obey God rather than man," answered Waldo, when the decision was reported to him, and sent the brethren out two by two into the surrounding countries. They multiplied with incredible rapidity from Aragon to Bohemia, their simple preaching finding a ready welcome among the lower classes.

The Waldenses have sometimes been classed, erroneously it would appear, with the forerunners of the Reformation. Their present faith seems a later development, due in part to persecution, in part to intercourse with the reformers of Bohemia. Their revolt was really ethical, not theological; a blow rather at the immoral character of its priests than at the structure or doctrine of the Church. For doctrine in itself they cared little; it varied, in fact, in different countries, and even in neighbouring communities. This was their weakness, the dissidence of dissent, a multitude of differing and even hostile branches, many of which were not free from gross superstitions, and

a slavish adhesion to the cramped exegesis of their founder. Their strength lay in their knowledge of the Bible, often it is true degenerating into a wild Apocalyptic Biblicism. Inquisitors tell us of peasants who could recite the Book of Job word for word, and had learned the whole of the New Testament in the vulgar tongue. Others speak of the purity of their lives; how they 'can be recognised by their customs and speech, for they are modest and well-regulated. They live by their labour as mechanics, their teachers are cobblers, they are chaste and temperate.' But though they had all virtues and all knowledge it would profit them nothing. Their revolt had struck at the sacerdotal roots of the Church, and at all costs must be crushed. So in dens and caves of the Alps they were tortured by their thousands, but endured as seeing Him who is invisible.

Walter de Map and the Curia had driven the Waldenses into schism; a wiser policy would have used and directed their enthusiasm. Where Waldo failed, Francis and Dominic succeeded. They were fortunate, no doubt, in having on the throne a strong man like Innocent III., not afraid to distinguish between things that differ, or to suspend judgment until he could judge a tree by its fruits. But there were other reasons for their

success and Waldo's failure. When the latter called his followers the "Poor Men of Lyons" he unconsciously wrote their doom. "The Poor Men" was the name of the secret associations that in the northern cities of Italy still clung to the memory and ideals of Arnold of Brescia. For Arnold and all his works the Curia cherished the undying hatred of victors who at one time were almost vanquished. So when the Italian "Poor Men" welcomed the new reformers of Lyons as brothers in a common cause, the Church overwhelmed both (Verona, 1184) in a common curse. That Innocent was conscious of the mistake is evident from his desire to convert the Waldenses into a society of "Poor Catholics" under the leadership of Durand of Huesca, a Waldensian barbe¹ from Aragon (1207). But the effort was too late; the mischief was done, and the Waldenses, purified and enlightened, have broadened out into "the Israel of

¹ Barbe: Low Latin, *barbanus*=uncle (cf. Friar, Padre, etc.), no doubt confused with *barba*, "because they most wore beards." For Durand of Huesca, see the confused account in Comba, *op. cit.* 55-60. There is much in the early history of the Waldensians that is hopelessly obscure. What became of Waldo? Died, says Comba, 1217. We doubt it. Their beliefs are uncertain—probably because of confusion with the Cathari, and additions by the Friends of God. The student should wade through cc. v. and vi. of Comba. But "dry light" in the matter is still to seek. Lea, i. 76-78, is concise but positive.

the Alps," the Protestant Church of Northern Italy.

The real secret of the success both of Cathari and Waldenses was the general consciousness that the Church had failed in its mission. Innocent was not ignorant where the blame lay. He knew that the sin must be laid at the door of the shepherds of Israel. 'The corruption of the people,' he owned, 'has its chief source in the clergy.' In every quarter of Christendom there was a profound conviction of the emptiness of sacerdotal Christianity. She was rich and increased in goods and had need of nothing, and cared not for the misery and degradation of her neglected flocks. The Latin Church might boast of its unity; in reality it was seething with revolt and schism, hatred of the clergy, and convulsive efforts to throw off an intolerable yoke.

III

We must beware lest the shadows in our picture be exaggerated. We may miss the silver lining with which God fringes the clouds. Iniquity is ever more trumpet-tongued than good, nor should we forget that the very evidence whereby this account of iniquity is received proves the existence of a better and higher ideal. History records with sarcasm the vices of hypo-

crites, but only the Great Assize can reveal the multitude that no man can number who in the night, amid

God's hail
Of blinding fireballs, sleet or stifling snow,

pursued

as birds their trackless way.

Their names are not found in any annals; they do not dwell in kings' palaces; no herald goes before them on the mountains. But in the continuity and succession of life, deeper far than the superficial continuities to which men sometimes cling, there are no breaks. In every age the children of God greet the promises from afar. In different ways they make it manifest that they seek a country of their own.¹

The proofs and illustrations of the above would require a volume where we can only afford a page. We can but outline certain phases of spiritual development which are often missed, reserving for another chapter the story of the great revival. The reader should note in the first place the higher idea that men had formed of their bravest and best. Under the influence of religion, chivalry, and the Crusades,

¹ For an example of piety from the class of artisans, cf. the life of Raymund Palmaris (b. 1140), excellently told by Neander, vii. 411-415.

the ideal of manhood became purified and ennobled. The "perfect knight" is no longer an ignorant and brutal warrior like Front de Bœuf. Instead of the berserker fighting for lust and gain, we have the champion of the Cross, the Cid rescuing Spain from the infidel, Tancred, or the peerless Godfrey who sometimes lingering at prayer forgot the hours of food, nor would he wear the crown where Christ had worn the thorns. Nowhere does this new conception of the dignity that religion can give to manhood come out more completely than in the poems that centre round the English Arthur, and in the contrast which they present to Turpin's older romance of Charlemagne and Roland. The king, Galahad, Percival, and their Quest of the Grail are the immortal creations of the twelfth century. But when Walter de Map and his German imitators purified the coarse songs of animal strength and passion, Cymric in origin, by putting into them the heavenly mysteries, they did more than write a romance. They created a new ideal. Lancelot and Tristram, representatives of a chivalry without purity, cannot sit in the Seat Perilous, or see the Holy Grail. This is reserved for Galahad, 'the haut Prince,' the 'servant of Jesus Christ,' who 'bore the crown of gold . . . and had about him a

great fellowship of angels'; or for Percival, 'as the tale telleth, one of the men of the world at that time that most believed in our Lord Jesus Christ,' type of the human soul, erring, despairing, repenting, yet at last attaining his desires.

In the world of experience the new chivalry found expression in the growth of the military orders. When, in 1119, Hugues de Payen and eight French knights devoted themselves to the task of keeping the roads to Jerusalem clear of robbers, and thus established the famous Templars, or when in the previous year Raymond du Puy reorganised the Poor Brethren of the Hospital of St. John, they opened out a new conception of holiness. Their idea was to unite under the banner of the Cross the two strongest impulses of the age, the impulse to fight and the impulse to watch and pray. Hitherto in Europe the two motives had been at variance, the knight and the monk had nothing in common. Henceforth, under the pressure of the Paynim, they become one; feudalism passes into the service of the Church. In the days that were gone her typical hero was Achilles, sulking in his tents over personal wrongs; her new ideal is the warrior who shall have approved himself most

in the service of man.¹ A further step was taken when in 1190 German democracy, under one Walpot von Bassenheim, a trader of Bremen, established the third great order of Teutonic knights, originally a union of ship captains from Lübeck for the succour of the sick and the dying at Acre. 'This Walpot,' we read, 'was not by birth a noble, but his deeds were noble.' The new order obtained vast possessions in Germany, and in 1228 drew their swords against the heathen Prussians, who, since their massacre of St. Adalbert, had steadily resisted all attempts at conversion. Henceforth their history is "a dim nightmare of unintelligible marching and fighting," but the results at any rate are luminous still. From their head centre at Marienburg they slowly subdued the pagans, and laid the foundations of modern Prussia.

Before we pass away from the military orders the reader should note the place they hold in the development of the religious ideal. They form the middle stage in a slow growth. In

¹ "I heard the other day of a very fine young fellow, who in the twelfth century might have been spearing lions and escorting pilgrims among the Templars, performing the extraordinary exploit of shooting fifty brace of grouse in twenty-five minutes . . . and the feat was considered so memorable that a granite column was erected to commemorate it. Some modern St. Bernard seems to me desperately needed" (Froude, *Studies*).

monasticism, if he would serve God, man must quit the world. Even Abailard in one of his letters to Héloïse tells with approval of a monk who said he had fled from his fellows because it was impossible to love both God and man at the same time. With the military orders, to serve God was to fight the world. St. Francis changed this into the nobler formula, to serve God we must serve the world. In this progress we should also mark a shifting of the centre of gravity of the three fundamental ideas. In the solitary hermit the central thought is asceticism; celibacy is a corollary, while obedience is impossible. In the wealthy monastery poverty becomes a counsel of perfection, and celibacy and obedience the distinctive marks. In the Friar, the thought of 'our Lady Poverty' is again uppermost, and a rule of life is framed in order to guard her. But the military orders anticipated the Jesuits by laying the emphasis on obedience. The applicant for admission begged that he might become the serf and slave of the "House" for ever, and was warned that he must surrender his will irrevocably. Now of all three virtues it is obedience that would prove most serviceable to the Papacy. For the realisation of the dreams of Hildebrand poverty is an incumbrance (it must be expelled even

from the Friars), sins against celibacy may be pardoned, but unswerving obedience is vital. In the great papal orders, therefore, — the Cistercian, the military, and the Jesuit,—this is the central idea; changed only by Loyola from its first rude military form to that more subtle and dangerous obedience which claims not merely the will but the intellect and imagination.¹

Nor must we overlook among the nobler aspects of the age the progress of mysticism. Mysticism cannot be defined, it can only be felt. To the mystic moral truth transcends all syllogisms; it is part of himself. Once he distinguished between the truth and himself, and in so doing was outside it; now "truth is no longer outside us nor even in us, but we are it and it is we; we ourselves are a truth, a will, a work of God. Liberty has become nature; the creature is one with his Creator—one through love." But this definition of Amiel, like every other definition of the ultimate things of the

¹ For an example of this obedience, cf. the well-known life of St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (d. 1231),—"the rarest type of womanly gentleness and self-abnegation, of all Christian virtues and spiritual aspirations,"—and her relations to Conrad of Marburg—"the most perfect embodiment of the pure fanaticism of his time." St. Elizabeth is the heroine of Kingsley's *Saint's Tragedy*.

soul, will appear foolishness except unto those to whom mysticism is the power of God. Like the definition, so the doctrines. The teaching of the mystics defies all rules of logic, bursts all bonds of philosophy, is variable as the clouds that fleck the blue, dies under the knife and the lens. Nevertheless, mysticism is in every age the salt of life, the savour of thought. In none was this more profoundly true than in the dark age from Bernard to Francis.

The Father of Western mysticism was the unknown writer of the fourth or fifth century, universally believed by the Latin Church to have been Dionysius the Areopagite. Underneath the wild excess of symbolism and neo-Platonism which lay on the surface and formed as it were the froth of Dionysian theology—(but upon which the Latin Church seized as the groundwork of its sacerdotal and sacramental system)—there was this measure of eternal truth, that religion is a thing of the heart, not of creed nor of ceremonial observance.¹ For him the Logos is the principle of unity in all life, filling and sustaining all the gradations and hierarchies of heaven and earth. The translation of his works by the famous John Scot, “the Erin-born,” introduced Eastern

¹ See Seebohm's *Oxford Reformers*, pp. 60-78.

mysticism into the Latin Church. Henceforth his influence was supreme. "Go almost where you will in the writings of the medieval mystics, into their depths of nihilism, up their heights of rapture or of speculation, through their overgrowth of fancy, you find his authority cited, his words employed, his opinions more or less fully transmitted, somewhat as the traveller in the Pyrenees discerns the fame of the heroic Roland still preserved in the names and in the legends of the rock, the valley, or the flower."¹ The most diverse systems found in the writings of the Areopagite their warrant and insignia. On this basis John Scot elaborated a daring pantheistic system of his own, while Aquinas and Dante owe to him the form in which they cast their mighty thoughts. But above all Dionysius was the prophet of the mystics. His ideas form the weft and woof out of which Adam and Richard of St. Victor, the last-named a native of Scotland, and in a later age St. Bonaventura and other lesser followers, wove their systems, half logic and half love; systems the value of which lay not so much in their fantastic allegories and exegesis as in their

¹ Vaughan, *op. cit.* p. 119. For John Scot, see a careful study by Poole, *Med. Thought*, c. 2. Also Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*, c. 5. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 133-137.

eternal protest that the kingdom of heaven is within. Alas ! cries Richard, how many come to the cloister to find Christ and find lying in that sepulchre only the linen clothes of formalism. He that would find the Risen Lord must use the 'six stages of contemplation': these are the wings with which the soul shall rise to dizzy heights of rapture and memories of unutterable glory.

Allied to mysticism, though more extravagant and self-assertive, was the prevailing prophetism. In all ages of corruption, both in the Old and the New Dispensation, the prophets have been the saviours of the Church. In days when religion is externalised, and the horizon of the soul contracted, God sends forth His irregulars, the free lances of enthusiasm, with their burning denunciations, and their dreams and visions of a Millennial Church, without new moons and sabbaths, and whose priests are after the order of Melchizedek, of a succession known only unto God. In Hildegard,¹ the abbess of a convent near Bingen, and the famous Calabrian seer Joachim di Fiori,² the spirit of prophetism that no time can destroy and yet no age fulfil, found its highest medieval expression. For both the central thought is the judgment that must await

¹ b. 1098, d. 1178.

² d. March 30, 1202.

a corrupted Church, whereby, however, she shall be purified and delivered. But in his love of nature, his emphasis of poverty as the great note of 'the age of lilies,' when men shall live in the plenitude of love, Joachim is a forerunner of Francis. At a later date the wild theories of *The Everlasting Gospel* (1254) and the other spurious works that circulated under his name were the hope and rule of the sterner sects of the Franciscans. Rather than abandon their crude beliefs, the Spiritual Franciscans and Fraticelli, together with the half-mad followers of Guliegma and Dolcino,¹ endured every torment that the ingenuity of their enemies could devise. For us their importance lies in the outbreak of sympathy which greeted their threats against a corrupted system, and the witness they afford, even by their extravagances, that the spiritual element in man can never die.

¹ For these, see Lea, vol. iii. cc. 1-3.

CHAPTER VI

THE COMING OF THE FRIARS

FRANCIS OF ASSISI: b. 1182; d. Oct. 3, 1226.

DOMINGO DE GUZMAN: b. 1170; d. Aug. 6, 1221.

*He stood before the sun
(The peoples felt their fate).
"The world is many,—I am one;
My great Deed was too great.
God's fruit of justice ripens slow;
Men's souls are narrow; let them grow.
My brothers, we must wait."*

AUTHORITIES.—For Francis, SABATIER, *St. F.* (“Others may have compiled ; M. Sabatier has interpreted.”) Readers of the stereotyped English edition should consult also the *Révue Chrétienne*, Aug. 1896, “A New Chapter of the Life of St. F.” Students must add SABATIER, *Speculum Perfectionis* (Eng. translation, but without the notes, by DR. EVANS). The first intelligent appreciation of Francis in England was in BREWER, *Monumenta Franciscana* (Rolls’), with eloquent introduction. (Vol. i. contains Eccleston’s account of the coming of the friars to England.) Then followed MRS. OLIPHANT, *F. of A.* (still good). JESSOPP, *The Coming of the Friars*, and RENAN, *Joachim de Flor* and *St. Francis* (translated in his *New Studies*), are excellent sketches. KNOX LITTLE, *St. Francis* (popular, but spoilt by its sermon-form). For the *Fioretti* (*The Little Flowers*), see T. W. ARNOLD’s beautiful translation in the Temple Classics. In this little volume we come nearer the heart of Francis than in tomes of erudite history, though much, of course, is legendary. Most of the quotations in the following chapter are from it. For the Stigmata of St. F., see the *Critical Study* in the Appendix of SABATIER, *St. F.* The older historians (MILMAN, etc.) are of little value. The later history of “The Spiritual Franciscans” is exhaustively dealt with by LEA, *Inquis.*, vol. iii. Cf. SABATIER, *Critical Study*. Cf. also OZANAM, *Les Poètes Franciscaines*, and, for art, p. 241, *note*.

For Dominic, we are reduced to the panegyrics of LACORDAIRE (trans. Hazeland) and DRANE (American Ultramontane).

THE COMING OF THE FRIARS

I

SUCH was in general the state of the Church at the close of the twelfth century; a gloomy picture, despite all the brighter colours which charity or insight may detect. In this hour of her need Rome was saved not so much by the genius and energy of her popes—great as the pontiffs of this evil time undoubtedly were—as by the labours of two of her sons. ‘Master Dominic and his brethren preachers’ revived once more the forgotten duty of preaching, while Francis and his ‘Little Brothers’ showed an astonished Europe how to remove mountains by faith wedded to love. In the *Private Journal* of Jacques de Vitry (1240) we read—

During my sojourn at the imperial court I have seen many things which deeply saddened me. They are so busy there with temporal and secular affairs, with quarrels and lawsuits, that it is almost impossible to speak about religious matters. I have nevertheless found in these countries one subject of consolation; it is that many persons of both sexes, rich and living in the world, leave all for the love of Christ. They are called Friars Minor. . . . They disentangle themselves com-

pletely from secular things, and make every day the most energetic efforts to snatch perishing souls from the vanities of this world, and draw them into their ranks. Thanks to God their labour has already produced much fruit, and they have conquered many souls. . . . I think it is to put to shame the prelates, who are like dogs incapable of barking, that the Lord wills before the end of the world to raise many souls by means of these simple and poor men.

In Dominic, the apostle of faith, and Francis, the apostle of love, the Latin Church will ever recognise the greatest and most successful of her champions, the two of whom Dante sings; by Providence

ordained, who should on either hand
In chief escort her: one seraphic all
In fervency; for wisdom upon earth,
The other splendour of cherubic light.
I but of one will tell; he tells of both,
Who one commendeth.

We will follow the advice of the poet and "tell" only of the more original of these two heroes of God.¹

¹ The story of Dominic still needs an interpreter. In the dreary panegyrics of his followers we discern as through a mist of words the outlines of a noble life which still awaits its Sabatier. Meanwhile we are reduced to the eloquent Lacordaire, or the ultramontane Drane. Much that I have written in the following chapter will apply equally to the Dominicans. The greatest difference of the two orders lay not so much in the greater devotion of the one as in their different ideals. Dominic waged war on ignorance and error; Francis on misery and ungodliness. See *infra*, p. 234.

The reader may be glad of the following skeleton of

II

Still young, he for his lady's love forswore
 His father, for a bride whom none approves,
 But rather, as on Death, would close the door.
 In sight of all the heavenly court that moves
 Around the Eternal Father, they were wed;
 And more from day to day increased their loves.
 She of her first love long bereft, had led
 A thousand years and yet a hundred more,
 By no man sought, life hard and sore bested.

But lest my hidden words the truth should veil,
 Francis and Poverty these lovers were
 Of whom I weave at too great length my tale.¹

Born at Assisi as the twelfth century was running out, Francis was the child of the middle

Dominic's life. Domingo de Guzman was born at Calarnéga in Old Castile, April 5, 1170; trained at the University of Palencia for ten years. Then entered the chapter of Osma, and was speedily made sub-prior. In 1203 went with its bishop to Languedoc (see p. 107), and remained behind to convert the heretics (1206). In 1206 founded his school for poor girls of gentle blood at Prouille (see p. 235). In October 1215 obtained from Innocent his formal sanction for his new community, at first merely a house of Augustinian canons. In 1217 left Languedoc for good, and took up his residence in Rome. Met Francis 1218, and seems to have adopted about this date the idea of poverty. The renunciation of property was solemnly passed in 1220. Died at Bologna, Friday, August 6, 1221. His founding of the Inquisition is a papal fiction (see p. 151 n.).

¹ The whole canto (*Paradise*, xi.) should be read. For Dominic, see canto xii.

classes. His father, Pietro Bernardone, was a wealthy cloth merchant. The education that his lad received had the usual limitations of the times. In one respect, however, the boy had an advantage. Owing to his father's business journeys to the fairs of France, he early acquired familiarity with the language and songs of the country to which he owed his name. This fact is of importance, for it was the very height of the age of chivalry, when the troubadours of Provence were a real power in the courts of Europe. Francis would be the troubadour of the people, singing to them the songs of the Divine Love.

There was nothing in the early life of Francis to foreshadow his future. A subtle criticism has sought to discover Paul the apostle in Saul of Tarsus, and to connect the gospel of the one with the Pharisaism of the other. It were an even greater task to discern the saint who trod the mountain tops with God in the giddy youth whose command of riches made him the flattered of the provincial nobility. Conversion was for him a radical change; not the slow breaking of the day, but the opening of the blind eyes. Nevertheless, it had its stages. He saw men as trees walking before he could discern the face of the Saviour. At twenty-one his dissipations

brought him face to face with death. Like one of old, he realised that he was in want; but he would not say "I will arise and go to my Father." He sought to satisfy the hunger of his soul with the husks of still deeper extravagance. Once more God's goodness arrested him. From this second fever he arose a new man. A divine restlessness possessed his soul. His conflicts were intense. He spent his days in a cave, from which he came home at night pale with the strain of the struggle. On one occasion he borrowed the rags of a beggar and stood for a whole day in the market-place with outstretched hands. Francis was in a fair way of becoming a saint after Rome's most approved pattern. From this he was saved by his heart of love. His compassion for the poor had been his redeeming feature in the days of his dissipation. This now became, in God's hands, the active principle in his conversion. Loving the leper and outcast, God's love became perfected in him. He was troubled by no subtle questionings of outward things, no groping after light, no wonder where to find the wicket-gate and the narrow way. Such subjective storms and darkness were rare in the thirteenth century; at any rate, to Francis all was objective and clear. The command came to him as to one of

old: This do and thou shalt live. He did not even ask, Who is my neighbour? the interpretation was exceeding broad; it was also very plain. Untroubled by the difficulties of exegesis, he took Christ literally. A more complex nature would have passed by on the other side; Francis, in the simplicity of love, did the duty of love which lay next to hand, however repulsive or exacting, and, ministering to the outcasts in the lazarettoes, he found, as did Sir Launfal, in the least of these His brethren the Christ Himself.

The growth of his religious life was not without its difficulties. No saint can ever escape the struggle with self. In the opening words of his last Will, Francis tells us—

See in what manner God gave it to me Brother Francis to begin to do penitence; when I lived in sin it was very painful to me to see lepers, but God Himself led me into their midst. When I left them that which had seemed to me bitter had become sweet and easy.

But his chief foes were they of his own household. His father had raised no objection to his extravagance so long as by it he qualified himself as the associate of fast young nobles. But the alabaster box of ointment broken over the Lord's feet filled him with indignation at the waste. No doubt the doings of Francis were more than trying. He would sell all that

he had to repair a ruined roadside chapel, or, ignorant of modern social science, would give his last coin to the beggar. So his father sought to restrain him by violence, cast him bound into his cellar, and applied to the magistrates to deal with the madman. This last step might have had serious consequences had not Francis appealed to the Bishop. On the day appointed, in presence of a great crowd of curious townsmen, the Bishop gave his decision. He advised Francis to give up all his property. This was exactly what Francis was longing to do. So then and there he made solemn renunciation of all, stripping himself even of his clothes. "Listen all of you, and understand it well. Henceforth I desire to say nothing else than this, 'Our Father which art in heaven.'" Henceforth he was free, free as the birds who seemed to him to live the perfect life; they build no barns and yet they sing unceasingly.

Francis had made the great renunciation. Henceforth for him, as for the Light of Asia, the life

Close set with purpose of prodigious love.

So full of a new joy he set off from Assisi, singing with full voice a song of chivalry, clothed only with an old garment which the

Bishop's gardener had thrown over his nakedness. In the forest some robbers suddenly attacked him. "Who are you?" they asked. "I am the herald of the Great King," he answered. "Lie there, then, poor herald of God," they sneered, as they stripped him of his mantle and flung him naked into the snow. The robbers gone, Francis resumed his singing, and set off to visit his friends the lepers. In ministering to them, or rebuilding with his own hands the ruined shrines of God, he found work that he loved. In one of these, St. Mary of the Angels,—its former name was Portiuncula, or The Little Portion,—there came to him the final call. It was the 24th of February 1209, the feast of St. Matthew. The gospel for the day was this: "Wherever ye go preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils. Freely ye have received, freely give. Provide neither silver nor gold nor brass in your purses, neither scrip, nor two coats nor shoes nor staff, for the labourer is worthy of his meat." To Francis these words were the voice of Christ Himself: "This is what I want," he cried. "This is what I am seeking. Henceforth I will set myself with all my strength to put it in practice." The next morning, without staff or purse or

shoes, he set off for Assisi, and began to preach.

We must leave the reader to search out for himself the record of how one by one other twelve joined themselves to St. Francis, drawn by the same desire for complete consecration—*nudi nudum Christum sequere*;—how from these humble beginnings the new order soon spread to every land; and how Rome, wise as ever in her generation, was quick to bring the new enthusiasm under her sanction and control. But the order itself, its ideal and place, cannot be so lightly dismissed. It forms one of the great spiritual epochs of mankind, the definite realisation in life, for the first time since the days of the apostles, of the profounder ideal of Jesus. That a company of men, laymen too, renouncing all that the world held dear, should wander barefoot over Europe, penetrating even to the Soldan's country, everywhere preaching the gospel to the poor, and, what was more, living it out as men had never seen it lived before; that these men, accepting insult and persecution, making their refuge for the night in haystack or lazareth, choosing for their homes the poorest and most neglected quarters—"the Stinking Lane and shambles of Newgate"—should find the highest joy of life in the

meanest drudgery that only love would undertake—this was indeed the bringing back the living Jesus from His grave of centuries. This was also the restoration of His teaching. The religious life had come to mean the cutting oneself off from life, the retiring like St. Bruno to some Grande Chartreuse, where in a rarer air, far from its noise and whirl, men could save their own souls and rule into their characters the fine lines. But to Francis the supreme bliss of life was not peace but work, or rather the peace which true work brings. For the Little Brothers were essentially an order of labourers. They went about doing good. They found their Grande Chartreuse in the wretched slums and hovels of overcrowded cities, their mountain tops of contemplation in the festering haunts of plague and fever. They saved themselves by losing themselves in saving the souls and bodies of others.

At first, as might be expected, the Little Brothers were exposed to no small measure of persecution. Their early tours read like thirteenth-century extracts from the Journals of Wesley or Nelson. When Brother Bernard came to Bologna the very children, 'seeing him in poor and threadbare habit,' made mock of him, 'while the men of the city plucked at his hood

and pelted him with dust and stones,' all which Brother Bernard 'bore with patience and with joy for the love of Christ.' Of the first missionary journey of the Three Companions we read that 'some listened willingly, others scoffed, the greater part overwhelmed them with questions: Whence come ye? Of what order are ye? And they, though sometimes it was a weariness to answer, said simply, We are penitents, natives of the city of Assisi.' When the authorities threatened to hang certain of their number as vagabonds they offered their own rope girdles as halters. Their first missionaries to Germany were roughly handled and expelled, in France they were mistaken for Cathari, while in Morocco five of them were tortured to death by the Saracens. But whether accepted or rejected they everywhere made common life with the poor, helping the labourers to gather the olives or strip the vines, singing the while their hymns of joy, or making merry like children at a feast over the broken scraps tossed to them from the rich man's table.

And then their sermons! Let the reader through the mist of centuries discern the following from *The Little Flowers* (p. 165):—

Ye must needs know that St. Francis being inspired of God set out for to go into Romagna with Brother Leo his com-

panion ; and as they went they passed by the foot of the Castle of Montefeltro ; in the which castle there was at that time a great company of gentlefolk and much feasting. . . . And St. Francis hearing of the festivities that were holden there . . . spake unto Brother Leo, Let us go up unto this feast, for with the help of God we may win some good fruit of souls. . . . Coming to the castle, St. Francis entered in, and came to the courtyard where all that great company of gentlefolk was gathered together, and in fervency of spirit stood up upon a parapet and began to preach, taking as the text of his sermon these words in the vulgar tongue—

So great the joys I have in sight
That every sorrow brings delight.

There was nothing remarkable in the preaching itself, no grace of oratory, no profundity of the thought, only men preaching Christ with burning love and conviction. Those who tried to repeat the sermons found it was impossible—they were so artless, so simple ; yet as they listened the downtrodden realised that God was their Father, robbers became honest men, the enemies of years were reconciled, and, strangest of all, the cities of Italy forgot the feuds of centuries. Wherever St. Francis went it was the same ; the pent-up enthusiasms of Europe were let loose. Men of wealth renounced their wealth that they might live among lepers and wash their sores ; the scholar abandoned his books that he might the better copy the Perfect Life. Of course, here and there, there were extravagances. Women appeared naked in the streets ; fifty thousand

children set off to conquer Palestine.¹ "Tomorrow," they laughed, on arriving at Genoa (August 1212), "you shall see how God cares for His army. Who would remain here when there lies a path in the sea between emerald walls to the land where glory awaits us?" Happy the little ones who had perished on the passes of the Alps, or had fallen by the wayside, crying out piteously as they caught sight of far-off towns, "Is that Jerusalem?" Their comrades were sold into slavery, the girls into infamy, by two merchants of Marseilles. But we have the high authority of Renan that for these excesses Francis was not to blame. It would be as fair to credit Luther with the excesses at Münster, or Wesley with the absurdities of Quietism. They were in fact part of the new enthusiasm of the age.

History tells us that this early enthusiasm did not last. It was impossible that it should. As Innocent III. had foretold, in his first interview with Francis, the primitive rigour of the rule was beyond human strength. Even in his

¹ The story of the two Crusades by the children, the German (1212) under a lad of twelve, Nicholas of Cologne, and the French under a shepherd lad, Stephen of Cloyes, is one of the most pathetic incidents of the Middle Ages. It is well told by G. B. Gray, *The Children's Crusade*.

own lifetime Francis had to mourn that the first simplicity had become perverted, that his ideal had lost the splendour of her maiden purity, the bridal dress was torn, the orange flower faded. Over his last years there lay the shadow of unrealised hopes. He saw that the life-blood of the brotherhood was being slowly drained away. We to-day can discern the cause, which was holden from the simple faith of Francis: a vigilant and skilful priestism, anxious to bring the new enthusiasm into line with the other forces of sacerdotalism. Though with Francis himself Rome dare not meddle, she flung round his followers, as she had already flung around the followers of the more docile Dominic, the subtle chains of privilege and discipline, transforming the greater part from burning evangelists into her faithful henchmen. The order, they said, had grown too large to keep up the old observances, or regard the ancient poverty. But in reality that arch-priest Gregory IX.—at that time Cardinal Ugolini—was not thinking of the old observances at all. They were merely the mask for his real design. For the reader should understand clearly what was the real question at issue between the “Zealots” and “Moderates”: not the length of a hood or the number of rags that could be stitched on an

old garment, as he sometimes in his weariness of the long controversy may imagine, but whether a society founding itself as much as possible on the simplicity and pattern of Jesus could be allowed in a world governed by priests. Cardinal Ugolini knew well—though his tools were blinded—that the question to be decided was the existence of the sacerdotal system itself. “There was a vast and intricate system, legal and almost commercial, secular in its interests, though daubed with religion on the outside, which this unfettered preaching would have swept away root and branch, had it not in some score of years, thanks to Brother Elias and the Moderates, been itself embodied in the system, and so rendered comparatively harmless.”¹ The vast increase of the order, as witnessed by the thousands gathered at the famous ‘Chapter of the Mats,’ convinced Rome of the necessity of supplanting the saint by some tool who should serve her purpose. To accomplish this, Ugolini worked upon Francis through Brother Elias—the evil genius of the brotherhood—and in 1220 Francis was practically deposed. He knelt at the feet of Peter of Catana and became a private brother. “From henceforth,” he significantly added, “I am dead to you.”

¹ *Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1899. An able article.

Francis was not blinded by his obedience. He was conscious of a lost ideal. In one of his dreams he saw the brothers, 'with loads upon their backs,' swept away by a 'mighty river, broad and rushing furiously.' The great river was the world. "The time will come," he said again, "when our order will have so lost all good renown that its members will be ashamed to show themselves by daylight." He became nearly blind with continual weeping. "We must begin again," he murmured, as he lay stricken with mortal sickness, "to create a new family who will not forget humility, who will go and serve lepers, and, as in the old times, put themselves always, not merely in words but in reality, below all men." "Ah!" he added, "if I could once again go to the Chapter General." In every age it has been the same. The saints of God have died, not having received the promises, but greeting their ideals from afar. Their task, to point the way; their reward, the Pisgah view and the kiss of God.

Though not quite forty-five his work for God was finished. By slow stages they brought him home to Assisi to die. Conscious that the end was near, he poured out his whole soul in an epistle to all Christians. The opening of this *Nunc Dimittis* is a strain of pure music—

I, Brother Francis, the least of your servants, pray you by that Love which is God Himself, willing to throw myself at your feet and kiss them, to receive with humility and love all words of our Lord Jesus Christ, to put them to profit and carry them out.

It closes with a prayer that rings in our ears like an apostolic benediction—

God Almighty, eternal, righteous, and merciful, give to us poor wretches to do for Thy sake all that we know of Thy will, and to will always what pleases Thee, so that inwardly purified, enlightened, and kindled by the fire of Thy Holy Spirit we may follow in the footsteps of Thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ.

As the last days dawned, all pain became lost in joy and song. "Father," said a physician, trying, after his kind, to conceal the incurable nature of the disease, "all this may pass away if it please God." "I am not a cuckoo," replied Francis, smiling, "to be afraid of death. By the grace of His Holy Spirit I am so intimately one with God that I am equally content to live or die." He then bade his companions sing his own sublime Canticle of the Sun. When they had sung the last verse, St. Francis added a new strophe—

Be praised, O Lord, for our sister, the death of the body,
Whom no man may escape.

Alas for them who die in mortal sin!

Happy they who are found conformed to Thy most holy
will,

For the second death will do them no hurt.

In the beautiful words of Thomas of Celano, 'he

thus went to meet death singing.' On Saturday, October 3, 1226, the end came. "I have done my duty," he said to the brothers as they knelt around him, "may Christ now teach you yours." His last smiling word was this: "Welcome, Sister Death." As his spirit passed away, without pain or struggle, innumerable larks alighted singing on the thatch of his cell.¹

III

The character of St. Francis is unique. In other souls have burned the sacred fires, but

¹ I add here the following account by Lacordaire (p. 240) (following the *Deposition* of Rodolf) of the death of Dominic at Bologna, August 6, 1221. The difference of the two scenes is characteristic. "As he had no cell of his own, they placed him in that of Friar Moneta. They wished to change his garments, but having none save those which he wore, Moneta gave him one of his own tunics with which to cover him. Friar Rodolfo supported the saint's head, wiping the death-sweat from his brow, the rest of the friars looking on weeping. In order to comfort them, Dominic said, 'Do not weep; I shall be of more use to you where I am going than I have been here.' One of the friars asked him where he desired to be interred. He replied, 'Beneath the feet of my friars.' . . . They then commenced the solemn prayers for the departing soul, in which, from the movement of his lips, Dominic appeared to take part. When they came to the words, 'Let the holy angels of God come forth to meet him, and conduct him to the city of the Heavenly Jerusalem,' his lips moved for the last time; he raised his hand heavenward, and God received his soul."

in none has so rare enthusiasm been joined with such simplicity and unity. In the early histories of his life there is almost a complete absence of the marvellous. Even the coarsest realised that the supreme miracle was the marvel of his love. With him every longing was lost in one, to live out the Sermon on the Mount with nothing altered or explained away. To most men such a life as he resolved to live would seem the way of the cross; to him it was the way of light and joy. Foremost in renunciation he yet stands out among religious leaders by his gaiety of spirit. The servants of God, he said, are really "jugglers," and "must revive the hearts of men" and lead them to spiritual joy. He called himself "God's troubadour"; he deemed perfection and joy equivalent terms. The astonishing thing is that he made thousands feel this truth of a transcendent idealism. A sour religion Francis could not endure. To him to walk in the light meant perpetual sunshine. "My brother," he said, "if thou hast some fault to mourn over, do it in thy cell, groan and weep before God, but here with thy brethren be as they are in tone and countenance."

Let the reader who would understand the heart of Francis turn to the record of the ever-memorable walk from Perugia, when 'grievously

tormented by the very bitter cold,' Francis discoursed of 'that wherein is perfect joy'—

O Brother Leo, thou little sheep of God, if with patience and with gladness we suffer all things, thinking on the pains of the Blessed Christ, the which we ought to suffer for the love of Him, O Brother Leo, write that here and herein is perfect joy (*Little Flowers*, c. 8).

Well did the early brethren learn the lesson. When men 'threw mud upon them, or put dice into their hands and invited them to play,' despoiling them of their only tunic, 'in the midst of their tribulations they still rejoiced.' When Brother Bernard drew nigh unto death, "Sursum corda, Brother Bernard, Sursum corda," cried Brother Giles with joyfulness. The face of the dying saint 'grew bright and joyful beyond measure' as he replied, "O brothers most dear, this I find within my soul, that for a thousand worlds the like of this I would not have served any other Lord." Brother Ruffino narrates that when he saw the Saviour His sign to him was this: 'As long as thou shalt live thou shalt no more feel sadness nor melancholy: he that made thee sad was the Devil.' Brother Masseo was so filled with

the light of God that from thenceforward he was always joyful and glad; and oftentimes when he prayed he would break forth into sounds of joy, cooing like a dove U U U.

Brother Jacopone of Todi—the author of the *Stabat Mater*, over whose tomb is written the touching epitaph, “*Stultus propter Christum*”—was thrown into a dungeon.

‘A cesspool,’ he writes, ‘opens on it, hence a smell not of musk. . . . I am tripped up of my irons, and wound round in a big chain. I have a little basket hung up on high, so that the mice may not injure it; it can hold five loaves, . . . while I eat them I suffer great cold.’

Nevertheless, such was his joy that he fills a volume with love songs to Jesus. Even the thunder of Celano’s *Dies Iræ*—“by common consent the chief glory of sacred poetry”—has in it a human voice “more tender and moving than anything in ancient or modern verse” (Macdonald)—

Qui Mariam absolvisti
Et latronem exaudisti
Mihi quoque spem dedisti.

Recordare, Jesu pie
Quod sum causa tuæ viae
Ne me perdas illa die.

Quaerens me sedisti lassus,
Redimisti cruce passus;
Tantus labor non sit cassus?

Think, kind Jesu!—my salvation,
Caused Thy wondrous Incarnation;
Leave me not to reprobation!

Faint and weary Thou hast sought me,
 On the Cross of suffering bought me;
 Shall such grace be vainly brought me?¹

But most of all do we catch the new joy of
 Christ in six lines by Brother Wernher von der
 Tegernsee—

Du bist min, ih bin din,
 Des solt du gewis sin;
 Du bist beslozen
 In minem herzen.
 Verlor'n is das sluzzelin,
 Du muost immer drinne sin.

“Thou art locked up in mine heart; the little
 key is lost; Thou must remain inside.”

In nothing is the “catholic wholeness” of

¹ In the *Dies Iræ* we trace, however, the later gloom of the Zealots. The two hymns the *Stabat Mater* and the *Dies Iræ* illustrate two tendencies of Franciscanism; on the one side towards *The Everlasting Gospel* (p. 204), and on the other towards Mariolatry. The exaltation by the Franciscans of the Virgin was in part the outcome of their democratic instincts, in part their answer to the Manichæan tendencies of the Cathari.

I should have liked to trace the outburst of sacred song that accompanied the Great Revival. For Jacopone, the reader should study Ozanam, *Les Poètes Franciscaines*, cc. 4 and 5 (the rest of the volume may be neglected). For Thomas of Celano, see Sabatier, 365, 385, 387, etc. In this connection I would also mention the dainty volume of the Rev. F. W. Macdonald, *The Latin Hymns in the Wesleyan Hymn Book*. This should be supplemented by a study of Adam of St. Victor (good translation of his hymns by Wrangham, 3 vols.). But for further study of Latin hymnology the reader must refer to the great work of Julian, *Dict. Hymnology*.

Francis' character more apparent than in his enjoyment of Nature. He felt himself one with her, for everywhere he realised the presence of love. In his passionate verse he claims the moon for his sister, the sun for his brother. He loved the purity of a drop of water; it was an anguish to him to see it sullied. He sometimes wished to see the Emperor. "I would ask him," he explained, "for the love of God to publish an edict against catching my sisters the larks." He had a special interest in bees, and as for flowers he could not see them without bursting into praise. They were the one luxury he allowed his disciples. Of his tenderness for all created things the sweet and simple stories are almost numberless, and would seem absurd to a generation that impales birds for the adornment of a hat. His sermon to the birds is well known, and forms one of the gems of the *Little Flowers*. The story suffers much by being isolated from its context. For it is in the same 16th chapter that we read how Francis received the counsel of God 'that it behoved him by preaching to convert much people: Thus saith the Lord, Say unto Brother Francis that God has not called him to this estate for himself alone, but to the end that he may gain fruit of souls, and that many

through him may be saved.' Then there came upon him the great joy of souls. 'Let us be going,' he cried; and forthwith set out, 'taking no thought for road or way':

And as with great fervour he was going on the way, he lifted up his eyes and beheld some trees hard by the road whereon sat a great company of birds; whereat Saint Francis marvelled, and said to his companions: 'Ye shall wait for me here upon the way and I will go to preach unto my little sisters, the birds.' . . . The sermon that Saint Francis preached unto them was after this fashion:—'My little sisters, the birds, much bounden are ye unto God, your Creator, and alway in every place ought ye to praise Him, for that He hath given you liberty to fly about everywhere, and hath also given you double and triple raiment; still more are ye beholden to Him for the element of the air which He hath appointed for you; beyond all this, ye sow not, neither do you reap; and God feedeth you, and giveth you the streams and fountains for your drink; the mountains and the valleys for your refuge, and the high trees whereon to make your nests; and because ye know not how to spin or sew, God clotheth you, you and your children; wherefore your Creator loveth you much, seeing that He hath bestowed on you so many benefits; and therefore, my little sisters, beware of the sin of ingratitude, and study always to give praises unto God.'

In his sympathy with nature Francis stands out almost alone among great reformers. Even St. Paul, with all his intense breadth, seems like the majority of the ancients to have been blind to the mysteries of nature. At Athens his eye cared nothing for the surpassing loveliness of the landscape; he was arrested rather

by an altar to the Unknown God. Francis could never have written St. Paul's amazing allegory: "Doth God take care for oxen?" As the Italian walked the lanes he felt that God so cared even for worms that he would stop and pick them up lest he should tread upon them. Nor could the saint of Assisi ever have ridden for a whole day, as did St. Bernard, by the shores of Geneva, and at the end of the journey, when his companions spoke of the lake, ask to what lake they referred, he had seen none. But because of this love of nature Francis has justly been called "the Father of Italian art." Materialism kills art; money cannot buy it; it is the child only of centuries stirred by mighty ideals, and penetrated with the conviction of the unity of nature. So in a later age Giotto and Fra Angelico painted in blue and gold the angels that Francis had seen everywhere ascending and descending upon the sons of men, while architecture inspired by love won its noblest triumphs. If we want his monument, we must look around at the peerless cathedrals which the reawakened piety of the thirteenth century built for God. 'The earth,' writes a Benedictine monk, 'woke from its slumber, and put on a white robe of churches.'

This unity of Francis' character was to some

degree the product of the times. Frederic Harrison has pointed out that the thirteenth century was the last age "when one half of the world was not engaged in ridiculing or combating what the other half was doing; nor were men absorbed in ideals of their own while treating the ideals of their neighbours as matter of indifference and waste of power."¹ From the Atlantic to the Black Sea the consciousness of Europe, if we may so express it, was still one. Francis reflected this unity in his complete freedom from all intellectual conflict. Unlike all other reformers, he waged no battles of the pen; as you study his life you are not disturbed with the pother and dust of vanished controversy. He was, in fact, profoundly unconscious—both of the difficulties of his teaching and the dangers that threatened it. He taught that men should seek a higher perfection than that set forth by the Church, without realising that this involved the reformation of the Church. He preached that society should go back to the Sermon on the Mount, at the very time that Innocent III. was making the Chair of the Fisherman into the most powerful throne since the days of the Cæsars. In an age when a dominant sacerdotalism had established impass-

¹ *The Meaning of History*, c. 5.

able gulfs between clergy and laity, he attempted a revolution whose ideal was the priesthood of all believers. But of all this Francis seems profoundly unconscious. Guided by a more complex character, in an age less profoundly united by a common faith, a common science, a common government, the great Franciscan rally would have ushered in a revolution two centuries before Luther. But such a revolution would not have been the Protestant Reformation. As that remarkable document, the last Will of Francis, abundantly proves, the saint had no quarrel whatever with the sacerdotal foundations upon which the real strength of Rome must always rest. He was no Waldensian; his faith in the Sacraments and priesthood was still unshaken. His poetical temperament would neither have understood nor sympathised with the logic of Calvin or the opportunism of Cranmer.

In one respect only does the unity of Francis' character fail: in his dread of the influence of learning. He was not even willing that they should become men of one book, his ideal rather was men of one life. "When you have a psalter," he said to one of the novices, "you will want a breviary, and when you have a breviary you will seat yourself in a pulpit like a great prelate." Then taking up some ashes, Francis scattered

them over the head of the novice, saying, "There is your breviary, there is your breviary." Francis was right in so far as he saw that logic and canon law monopolised the secular clergy. But Francis failed to see that by laying the foundations of life in love, knowledge would become a true handmaid to work. Nevertheless, to Francis Europe owes, to some extent, the rise of science. He really taught men, though he knew it not, to turn for the truer culture from verbal quibblings to the study of nature, while their care for men's bodies, their loving service among the lepers, soon developed among the order the physical studies for which they became celebrated. Within a few years the brethren became the intellectual leaders of Europe. They learned the great truth which history repeats in every revival: no Church can be built up on mere experience, or by descending to the social condition of the outcast. They set out to win the towns for Christ; they found the towns in a ferment of unbelief. To obtain a hold they must enter into the intellectual as well as the moral difficulties of their flocks. The Dominicans, to their credit, from the first perceived this, and eagerly sought out the centres of learning. Their leader's first effort to fight the heretics of Toulouse had been the establishing of

a large school for girls at Prouille. His followers speedily captured the rising universities. Their headquarters were at Paris and Bologna; in England their earliest convent was at Oxford. The Franciscans were not slow to follow. Their first English Provincial 'built a school in the fraternity of Oxford, and persuaded Master Robert Grosseteste of holy memory to read lectures there to the brethren.' The revival of religion was followed by a revival of learning, but the great teachers of the age drew their inspiration from the Cross. The five great doctors of the later scholasticism all belonged to the Mendicants; Albert the Great and Thomas of Aquinas were followers of Dominic; Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, and Ockham of Francis. To these we must add Adam Marsh, Raymond Lull, and a long list of distinguished names. But greatest of all was Roger Bacon. 'Unheard, forgotten, buried,'—to quote his own sad verdict on his life,—Bacon struggled for a century with the ignorance of the times, answering the problems of authority and method, pleading for "the reign of law" in the realm of phenomena, and leaving to future ages to "roll away the obscurity that has gathered round his memory, and to place first in the great roll of modern science the name of Roger Bacon" (Green).

Our national pride will note that with few exceptions every great man of learning in the Franciscan order hailed from England.¹ We are proportionally scanty in the roll of great Dominicans. The teaching of Francis seems to have suited our national temperament; and the heroic period of the movement to have found its true home among us. By their enthusiasm, their democratic tendencies, their emphasis of practical holiness, their insistence, in the words of Grosseteste, 'that ordinary law and right must give place to the salvation of souls,' the stress they laid on the human side of our Lord's life and sufferings, the Franciscans touched a sympathetic chord in our character that the Dominicans, with their greater fidelity to the teaching of their great doctors, their stern insistence on orthodoxy and authority, failed to reach. But we must beware lest we flatter ourselves overmuch. If throughout the Middle Ages "Franciscanism was the fruitful parent of new philosophies and new social movements, of new orthodoxies and new heresies" (Rashdall),

¹ I have not dwelt on the familiar story of the coming of the friars to England. But readers ignorant of this delightful chapter should read it as told by Jessopp (from Eccleston). For the contrast of the Franciscan and Dominican philosophies, see Rashdall, *op. cit.* ii. 526 sq. Also Brewer, *Mon. Fran.*, pp. liii.-lix.

the cause will probably be found in the greater emphasis of individualism by its founder, and his fear of crippling life by red tape and institutions.

IV

Viewed as a reformer the secret of Francis' power lay in his belief in the infinite power of love. In one of the visions of his last days Francis saw an angel holding in his left hand a viol and in his right hand a bow, and as the angel drew the bow once upwards across the viol there issued such sweetness of melody as melted his soul. Of this vision we find the interpretation in the words of Bonaventura: "His heart was a perfect instrument, as soon as the words 'love of God' touched it every chord within it vibrated as a violin responds to the bow, and gave forth powerful and harmonious tones." Others besides St. Francis have recognised that "imperious desire for immolation which lies in the depth of every soul"; his is the peculiar glory of seeing that the highest "immolation" and the most perfect self-surrender can only be found in perfect love. Love taught him also the secret of all evangelical success. His was the idealism which sees in the lowest and vilest the brother for whom Christ died. "There are men," he said, "who to-day

appear to be members of the Devil who one day shall be members of Christ." "Sinners," he added, speaking of certain notorious robbers, "are brought back to God better by gentleness than by cruel reproof; therefore search diligently for them until thou find them, and give them this bread and wine from me." The ideas of Francis were not new. His dream of poverty was "in the air." In his boyhood he would hear of the Poor Men of Lyons, while echoes of the teaching of Joachim di Fiori must have reached Assisi. Even the lepers had not been without their friends. Before the days of Francis the Crucigeri, an order founded by Alexander III., had established over forty houses in Italy and Palestine devoted to their care, one of which was at Assisi. What was new was a love that turned the aspirations of the few into the life experience of thousands in every country of Europe.

We do well to remember that the Little Poor Brothers were originally laymen.¹ The significance of this cannot be exaggerated. For

¹ Francis was in spirit a layman to the end. But in 1210 Innocent insisted on the friars receiving the tonsure. Henceforth Francis was a deacon. To this day his is the only order in which there is no difference of costume between laymen and priests.

centuries the laity had had little place in the organisation of the Church. Now Europe was flooded by a host of lay preachers, most of whom earned their living, like St. Paul, by the labour of their hands. While Brother Giles was waiting for a ship whereby he might sail to the Holy Land he carried water and made willow baskets. When other occupations failed, the brethren hired themselves out as servants. Only in case of need did they resort to "the Table of the Lord"—the amazing name which Francis gave to the begging from door to door. The new place of the laity was also emphasised by St. Francis in his foundation of the Tertiaries or Third Order (1221). Francis was not "the harmless enthusiast hardly of sane mind" that Hallam calls him; on the contrary, the strong common sense of his character stands out in many ways. He realised that his life could never be the life of all men; that it was the life of the apostles of the gospel, not the life of the great company of believers. We err greatly if we suppose that Francis condemned indiscriminately either the family or property. "He simply saw in them ties from which the apostle, and the apostle alone, needs to be free" (Sabatier). But the life and labour of love was open to all. So in an age when all

men were seeking to become guilded, Francis formed his great Guild of the *Brothers and Sisters of Penitence*. Of this lay fraternity the obligations were peace and charity, while the rich were to distribute their surplus wealth to the poor. The first member was a merchant of Siena who had made an enormous fortune by "cornering" wheat in a time of scarcity, but who now turned his house into a hospital.

The founding of this order was the beginning of a social revolution, the depth of which was hidden from our older historians. We see the influence of this call for fraternity in the rapid rise in France alone of the number of leper hospitals from a few to over two thousand. But by nothing is the success of Francis' attempt to bring the classes together more clearly brought out than in the famous tale of the *Little Flowers*—

How St. Louis, King of France, went in person in the guise of a pilgrim to Perugia for to visit the holy Brother Giles. . . . So the porter went to Brother Giles and told him that at the door was a pilgrim that asked for him. . . . And being inspired of God it was revealed to him that it was the King of France : so straightway with great fervour he left his cell, and ran to the door, and without further questioning, albeit they ne'er had seen each other before, kneeling down with great devotion they embraced and kissed each other, with such signs of tender love as though for a long time they had been close familiar friends ; but for all that they spoke not, the one nor the other, but continued in this embrace in silence.

Let us hear the comment of one of our own prophets. "Of all which story not a word of course is credible by any rational person. Certainly not: the spirit nevertheless which created the story is an entirely indisputable fact in the history of mankind. Whether St. Louis and Brother Giles ever knelt together in Perugia matters not a whit. That a king and a poor monk could be conceived to have thoughts of each other which no words could speak . . . this is what you have to meditate on here." ¹

The comparison has been made by writers not a few between Francis and Wesley. Superficial as such contrast must necessarily be, it is not without interest and profit. "John Wesley was, in fact, the St. Francis of the eighteenth century. Like him, he received in his spiritual experience the direct call of God to a complete surrender of self. Like him, he found in the love of God the central truth which inspired his life and ruled his will. To live the life of Jesus Christ in the world was the common object of both — of the one through imitation of His poverty, of the other of His sinless perfection. The revival of personal religion in a coarse and profligate age

¹ Ruskin, *Mornings in Florence*, p. 89. The work should be read for its account of the relation of St. Francis to art. Cf. also Lee's *Renaissance Fancies*.

through the instrumentality of a society was their common achievement. The Methodist, like the Friar Minor, took the world as his parish. He planted himself in the crowded cities and among the outcast populations. His mission was to the poor, the unlearned, and the neglected. He cared not for boundaries of parish or country. Borne on the wings of love, he crossed the seas, bringing to all who would hear . . . the glad tidings of forgiveness. Indeed, with due allowance for the differences of the time, the methods as well as the objects of Wesley were singularly like those of St. Francis. There was a similar use of colloquial and simple sermons, similar reiteration of a few all-important truths, similar renunciation of all pomp and splendour of service or building, similar religious use of hymns and music." We might add, a similar revival of field preaching and a similar call for the services of the laity. "Even the obstacles which they encountered and the difficulties which they raised were similar. The sneer of the worldly, the accusation of fanaticism, the dread of the orderly, the dislike of the parish clergy, the timidity of the bishops, the self-sufficiency of the members of the society themselves, were trials common to both. That the sons of St. Francis, with all his individuality, remained devoted children of

the Church, that the sons of Wesley, with all his personal loyalty, found their natural sphere outside the Church, was due under God to the circumstances of the time.”¹ The comparison might be pressed to further detail. If the one had his yearly Conference, the other had his Chapters General, the first at Michaelmas, the second and more important at Whitsuntide, when all the brethren foregathered from far and near that they might gain new enthusiasm by the communion of saints. Cried Cardinal Ugolini when he beheld five thousand brethren gathered at ‘the Chapter of the Rush-mats’—

‘Of a truth this is the camp and the army of the knights of God.’ . . . Nor was there heard in so great a multitude or idle speech or foolish jest, but wheresoever a company of brothers was gathered together they either prayed or said the office and bewailed their sins, or discoursed concerning the salvation of souls.

The following appeal of Francis might take its place as one of Wesley’s *Twelve Rules of a Helper*:—

By the holy love which is in God I pray all the friars, ministers, as well as others, to put aside every obstacle, every care, every anxiety, that they may be able to consecrate them-

¹ Wakeman, *Church of England*, p. 448. Cf. Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars*, p. 49. Nor has Methodism been without its “Zealots” and “Moderates.” We shall note in another place how Wyclif copied the methods of Francis.

selves entirely to serve, love, and honour the Lord God with a pure heart, and a sincere purpose, which is what He asks above all things.

As regards their characters the resemblance is less. Wesley is as complex as Francis is simple. In his dread of the sunnier sides of life Wesley was the child of Puritanism; Francis by his joyous simplicity the founder of Italian art. Wesley, like all great Englishmen, was a man of gigantic will. Ugolini would have found it a difficult task to force this man, "whose genius for government," wrote Macaulay, "was not inferior to that of Richelieu," into a system destined to destroy his ideal. His keen eye would have detected, his energy baffled, the snares that thwarted St. Francis. Of Wesley we may say with Green, "no man ever stood at the head of a great revolution whose temper was so anti-revolutionary"; of Francis, that no man whose unconscious purpose was so revolutionary so successfully bolstered up existing institutions. To future ages the greatness of Wesley will probably lie in the world-wide Church that bears his name; the greatness of Francis lies rather in his character. Amid much that was coarsely self-seeking in medieval Christianity the eye of Francis was so single that he sought the loveliness of Love for Love's own sake. In

the purity of his devotion there was neither the ineffectual selfishness of "otherworld-mindedness," nor the blindness which makes men the slaves of the present. In diverse manners have men at sundry times figured unto themselves the Eternal, but speculation and ecstasy alike have always found their highest term in that utter disinterestedness of soul of which Francis is the completest type since the days of St. Paul.

The work of Wesley has been a more complete success than even his dreams could have anticipated, though its lines of development may not have been his first intentions. But Francis would have been the first to own that the organisation he founded has not fulfilled in its history his aims or ideals. A movement which in its origin was anti-monastic added another to the long family of monkish orders. Their devotion to 'Lady Poverty' gave place to the ingenious dialectics, by which they were enabled to accept the wealth that poured in upon them from every quarter. Their simple preaching of the Cross ended in a disastrous Mariolatry, against which to their honour be it said the Dominicans protested. A revival, whose starting-point was the value of the individual layman, bequeathed to the Papacy, as the champion of sacerdotalism, a standing army, speaking

all languages, scattered through all nations, maintained without cost, and sworn to unhesitating and exclusive service. Exempt from all jurisdiction save that of their own superiors, the friars became Rome's network of irresponsible police. Their power overshadowed the bishop, their Inquisition extinguished liberty in a deluge of blood. By their energy and popular favour they still further degraded the secular clergy, into whose parishes they intruded, whose functions they usurped, and whose churches they superseded by stately edifices that would have made St. Francis weep. To the long quarrel between secular and regular they now added the more bitter struggle between secular and friar, the mutual hatred of the rival mendicants, and the dreary civil war between the "Zealots" and "Moderates."¹

We must be careful lest we paint the later degeneracy of the Mendicants in colours too dark. That they had not lost the self-abnegation of their early days was abundantly shown during the Black Death of 1349. The priests, as a rule, abandoned their posts; but the friars stayed by the sick, and were swept away in their thousands. But even if the order ever became

¹ We shall have more to say on this matter in a later volume, as also on the later degeneracy of the friars.

as vile as some historians would have us believe, the Church of Christ can never forget the debt that she owes to St. Francis. Himself a simple layman, his is the only great spiritual movement that ever sprang direct from the people. Luther and Wesley belong to the University, the fathers of Puritanism are the doctors of Geneva, but the Little Poor Brothers of Assisi sprang from the common soil. Hitherto monks had belonged to the upper classes; only to the aristocrat did the law allow the refuge of the cloisters. The poor were chattels tied down to the glebe; the heavenly walks were not for them. But in the brotherhood of Francis caste distinctions were unknown; the men whom feudalism and the Church had despised took the world by storm. The very title of the order is untranslatable because of its democratic significance. In all the towns of Europe the people were divided into *majores* and *minores*; the nearest equivalent perhaps would be 'gilded' and 'ungilded.' Francis deliberately enrolled himself with the latter; his was the company of the "Brothers Minor." The coming of the friars is, in fact, the greatest popular work recorded in history. It is even more; it is the only successful effort ever made by the people themselves

towards constructive socialism. His inspiration was love, his dream the gospel ideal. Of the omnipotent law of elevenpence three-farthings, as of the tender mercies of the survival of the fittest, Francis was as ignorant as his Master. Advocates of both will count his life madness and folly.

For a few years the Sermon on the Mount became a realised fact. But the dream passed away, the inspiration vanished; once more men slept in the dust of the earth, for the times were not yet. Yet at the end of the days Francis shall stand in his lot. The seed sown so many springs ago in the fields and lanes of Italy shall still bear its hundredfold. Pure seekers after God will ever feel his gentle influence, and follow in flight the white wings of Francis as he soared toward the Infinite and Eternal Love.

The Master whisper'd,
'Follow the Gleam.'

.
There on the border
Of boundless ocean,
And all but in heaven,
Hovers the Gleam.

PART VI
THE FALL OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY

CHAPTER VII
THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITIES

*Then, when a little more I rais'd my brow,
I spied the master of the sapient throng,
Seated amid the philosophic train.
Him all admire, all pay him rev'rence due.
There Socrates and Plato both I mark'd,
Nearest to him in rank; . . .
Galenus, Avicen, and him who made
That commentary vast, Averroes.*

HELL, c. iv. 127-141.

AUTHORITIES.—§ 1. RASHDALL, *The Univs. of Europe in the M. A.* (2 vols. in 3), supersedes all others, and is indispensable (full bibliography), not only for its own subject but for its side discussions. Of older works, LAURIE, *The Rise and Early Constitution of Univs.*, may be mentioned; also MULLINGER, *Univ. Camb. from the Earliest Times*, 2 vols. (also in shorter form). Of this the Introduction should not be neglected. For an earlier period, MULLINGER, *Schools of Charles the Great*. (These two works form the basis of much in vol. i. c. 6. I regret their omission in the list of "Authorities.") WEST, *Alcuin and the Rise of Christian Schools*.

Before reading this chapter the student should refresh his memory of vol. i. c. 6, especially of the work of Abailard. COMPAYRÉ's *Abélard and the Origin of Univs.* should be used with care, though its main thesis is undoubtedly correct. The best guide is POOLE, *Med. Thought*, cc. 4-7.

§ 2. Begin with ALLEN, *Continuity of Christian Thought*, then read HAMPDEN, *Scholastic Phil. in relation to Theology*. For further work, MAURICE, *Medieval Phil.*, and for the more philosophical aspects, UEBERWEG (stiff). TOWNSEND, *The Great Schoolmen of the M. A.*, is sympathetic and simple. VAUGHAN, *Life and Labours of St. Thomas Aq.* (2 vols.), is a fair R.C. account. Readers of French should not neglect the great work of HAURÉAU, *Philos. Scholastique*. For German works and translations, see UEBERWEG. MILMAN, HALLAM, etc., are of little value. For theological aspects, consult HARNACK. Read DANTE, *Par.*, c. x.

THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITIES

I

It is the eternal light of Sigebert,
Who 'scap'd not envy when of truth he argued,
Reading in the straw-litter'd street.¹

THE student will have noticed that while the nineteenth century develops its life on the lines of individualism and nationalism, the Middle Ages sought rather to realise itself in institutions international in character and, to some extent, socialistic in conception. Of these institutions feudalism, the special representative of which was the Holy Roman Empire, and the Papacy had risen together and for centuries run a parallel course of opposition and support. But by the thirteenth century the Empire had broken up into the constituent nations, while the Papacy, though apparently at the height of its power, had called into being forces destined to prove its ruin. Side by side with these there had arisen the

¹ Dante, *Par.* x., 132. The Rue du Fouarre "straw" in the Quartier Latin was the street of the schools.

third great institution of monasticism. Though in its later years it forgot the quarry from whence it was hewn, monasticism in its origin was essentially the protest of the lay spirit against a dominant sacerdotalism, while throughout its career it consistently despised the genius of nationalism, the growing power of which was the rock on which it was finally broken. Monasticism in fact had run its course and finished its work when the generation after St. Bernard witnessed the growth of a fourth institution. In the rise of the universities we see the resultant of three forces—the protest once more of the lay spirit, the internationalism of the Middle Ages, blended with the growing consciousness of the separate nationalities.

From the seventh to the eleventh century such intellectual light as there was had been confined to the cloister, and that light was rather the shining of a few stars in a waste of darkness than the flush of dawn. But with the eleventh century the spirit of new hopes moved on the face of the waters. Here and there amid the welter and chaos dry land began to appear; here and there a keener eye might discern the first shoots of verdure. As the nations emancipated themselves from the mere struggle for existence, as under the influence of the Crusades the West

came in contact with the more civilised East, men became conscious of the buried treasures of the past. From the Jewish schools of Spain, and the Arabic culture of Bagdad and Cordova, travellers like Adelard of Bath (1140) brought back the first rudiments of the physical and mathematical sciences, while Salerno revived once more the study of medicine. Everywhere men roused themselves from the long night of darkness, and with the vigour of the newly awakened flung themselves into the pursuit of truth. Christendom hailed with enthusiasm the new power of mind, as the hope of a world hitherto ruled by brute force tempered by superstition.

The new intellectual activity at first concentrated itself round the old centres. But the defect of monasticism was its essential selfishness. Educational usefulness was no part of its real programme; though the education provided was generous, nevertheless it bore the stamp of being an "extra." The schools for the monks and outsiders were kept strictly apart, and of course the first concern of the monastery was for its own inmates. During the twelfth century the monasteries one by one closed their gates to seculars, a course for which they might seek justification in the rapid rise of the more unrestricted schools of the collegiate foundations,

though the real reason was the loss of their vital force. The rapidity of the change is remarkable. In Anselm we have the greatest of monastic teachers; half a century later, in Abailard, education had abandoned the monastery for the cathedral. This, therefore, is the first step to be noted in the evolution of the university. The universities of Northern Europe, when not the result of "migration," always rise in connection with a great collegiate church; they are never the offspring of a monastery.¹ St. Gall, Fulda, Bec, Malmesbury, or St. Albans might have retained to this day their once proud position of the intellectual centres of Europe; that they lost it for ever to obscure and modern rivals must be entered against them as the punishment of monastic selfishness.

We may best illustrate the stages of growth by the history of Paris, the most famous university of Europe. We have first the school of Notre Dame, the education at which would be confined to "grammar." But with the widening intellectual activity the curriculum broadened, while the fall of monasticism as the ideal life led to a demand for the better education of the secular clergy. These the great Parisian

¹ Hence we must beware of tracing the rise of Oxford to the monks of St. Frideswide's, or Cambridge to the monks of Ely.

monasteries of S. Victor and S. Geneviève were reluctant to admit to their lectures unless they would first turn monk, so the chapter appointed certain of their number to give instruction in theology in addition to the usual course of "arts." At first the school had little repute; it was overshadowed by Chartres and Laon. To Abailard and the successors he trained, Paris owed the foundation of her prestige. The width of his knowledge, the daring of his genius, drew students by hundreds from castle and town to the new species of tourney, where the partisans of hostile principles encountered one another in the lists of controversy with all the bitterness of feudal warfare.

The cathedral authorities naturally took steps to secure permanence for their prosperity. There was ever the danger lest the school should be broken up by the death of some famous "master," or migrate elsewhere through the growing fame of some new teacher. Both perils would be avoided if masters and scholars could be attached to Paris by solid advantages. Whether through foresight or the instinct of preservation, the chapter therefore flung open to all the profession of teaching. The one condition they imposed was that masters should receive a license from a special member

of their body, their corresponding secretary or "chancellor." The chancellor, of course, before issuing his license, would satisfy himself that the master possessed the needed acquirements. As a result of these measures we find that, within a generation of the death of Abailard, the school of Paris had acquired European fame. To the island in the Seine, as to a new Mecca, masters and scholars crowded in their thousands, stirred by the same spirit of impatience with the older traditions of Europe that at the beginning of the century had hurried a ruder feudalism to recover the tomb of its Lord.

A school which attracted students from different nations received the technical name of a *studium generale*. Like the English "public school," this title was at first very vague. Only gradually did it come to denote a university. At the end of the twelfth century there were two schools which had obtained international reputation: Paris, for arts and theology; Bologna, for law. Their masters were held in such esteem that custom had granted to them the right of teaching in any school without fresh license. This last privilege led to important developments. When in 1224 Frederic II. founded the *Studium Generale* of Naples, he granted to its masters the *jus docendi ubique*, to

give the technical name by which this much-prized right of Paris and Bologna was known to the jurists. The Pope, of course, could not submit to this claim of his rival to be the educational head of Europe, so when Gregory IX. founded his "spiritual garrison" at Toulouse (1233), a bull conferred on its masters a similar privilege. As other schools eagerly competed for the same advantage, it became the law that a true *studium generale* must have obtained by charter from one of the world-powers, either Pope or Emperor, preferably the former,—the local sovereign was not sufficient,—the coveted *jus docendi ubique*.

The reader may ask why in the last paragraph we used the cumbrous title *studium generale* instead of the familiar university. It were well, therefore, to explain what precisely this last term represents. "University" is simply the common medieval name for any corporation or guild. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries "the instinct of association swept like a great wave over the towns of Europe." Everywhere we witness the struggle of the "lesser folk" against the "greater folk," of the unenfranchised mass against the "gilded" few.¹ On the

¹ See Brentano's *History and Development of Guilds*. The strength of Guild-life is one of the first things that the student of the M. A. must realise. Cf. Green, *The English Towns*.

Continent the struggle was protracted through a century of bloodshed. Even in more peaceful England the conflict was bitter and prolonged. But whether in England or on the Continent, the weapon of the oppressed was the same—the unenfranchised united in “guilds” which slowly wrested the franchise from the older oligarchies. Every such guild would be called a *universitas*.¹ The “university,” therefore, was simply a guild or club, in Bologna of students, at Paris of masters, banded together to secure their rights. But when a new *studium generale* was founded the students and masters either copied or carried with them the “universities” of the two great mother institutions. Thus the “guild” became so inseparable an accompaniment that by the fifteenth century the older title had become extinct save in charters and codes.

The university of Paris was a guild of masters. For the masters were at first under the absolute

¹ Perhaps the most curious instance of the meaning of “university,” and also of the medieval instinct for association, is the following: “When in 1284 the Pisans were defeated by Genoa, a large body of Pisan captives were kept in prison for eighteen years. While in their miserable jail they assumed the right of using a common seal which bore the legend, ‘The seal of the University of the Captives at Genoa.’” (Rashdall, i. 303, n.). The reader will not henceforth need to be warned against the common delusion that a university is a *universitas facultatum*, an institution professing universal knowledge.

control of the chancellor of Notre Dame. He could not only grant or refuse a license, he could take away licenses already given. Evidently a guild was needed for mutual defence. The object was twofold: to protect the masters against the arbitrary authority of the chancellor,¹ to raise their emoluments by restricting new licenses. Such a "university" had at first no legal rights whatever. Like our modern trades unions, it slowly won its emancipation, in spite of law, chiefly by a free use of boycotting, furthered by appeals to the papal authority. For from the first the Papacy, "with that unerring instinct which marks its earlier history, sided with the power of the future and against the efforts of a local hierarchy to keep education in leading strings." Rome saw that it would avail her nothing that she had crushed the independence of the bishops if the control of the new learning should pass into their hands. So when in 1212 the chancellor, as the bishop's

¹ At Oxford the chancellor soon ceased to be the officer of his distant bishop at Lincoln, and became one in interest with the university. This development was assisted by the fact that in the early years of the university the see of Lincoln was vacant, and that its first chancellor, Grosseteste (1214?), was not the man to be the tool of anybody. For Grosseteste's work at Oxford and his connection with the Friars, see Stevenson, *op. cit.* cc. 2 and 3.

representative, sought to compel all masters to take an oath of obedience, Innocent III. interposed. When at a later date bishop and chancellor again attempted to strangle the growing guild, furbishing up for the purpose, like English manufacturers at the beginning of the nineteenth century, an old ordinance against "conspiracies," Gregory IX. again stepped in. Henceforth at Paris the guild was free to develop on its own lines. The bishop had lost the control of his own *studium*; the "university" had usurped both name and power.

At Bologna the university was a guild not of masters, but of students. For the origin of this extraordinary difference we must look to the different conditions which gave rise to the intellectual movement in Italy. In the north of Europe the complete overthrow by barbarian or Saracen of the old Roman civilisation had flung upon the Church the task of educating the people. But in Italy the educational traditions, and to some extent even the educational machinery, of the old Roman world still survived. In France all teachers were ecclesiastics, at any rate were "clerks." But in Italy, where the race of lay teachers seems never to have died out, they were not subject more than other laymen to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor

entitled like their brethren of Paris to the special privileges of the priestly caste. At Bologna, in fact, the "doctor" was simply a private adventurer—like the sophist of ancient Athens or the Cambridge "coach"—whom a certain number of students hired for their instruction. Each doctor lectured in his own room, and depended for his pupils upon his reputation or powers of canvassing. In Italy the chief factor in the transformation of such a school into a *studium generale* was not so much the Church as the rivalry of the same vigorous civic spirit which in other spheres has shed immortal lustre on Florence, Genoa, and Venice.

Of even more weight in the formation of the student-universities of Italy was the nature of the chief study. At Paris the military ardour of the North manifested itself in tournaments of logic. But the key to the history of Lombard cities and Lombard schools lies in the recognition of the continued existence through the darkest ages of the old Roman system of jurisprudence. When the age of iron gave place to the first rude attempts at order, Roman law was bound to reassert itself, while appeal to its authority was furthered by the struggle between Empire and Papacy. In a land more conscious

than any other of the root-ideas of the Holy Roman Empire, both sides anxiously searched in the records of the past for the evidence of their claims. The schools of Paris were distracted by endless questionings concerning the reality of universal ideas; for Italy and imperial Germany the solution of the vital problems of liberty and politics lay in the study of law, both Roman and Canon. Now the law is a superior faculty. While, therefore, "the artist" of Paris was a mere lad whom the masters compelled to sit on the ground, 'that all occasion of pride may be taken away,' the student of Bologna was a man, an "artist" probably of some other *studium generale*, who for the sake of advancement had found it necessary to obtain a knowledge of Roman jurisprudence. Such men were of all nations and from many different cities. Nor were they adventurous lads for whom politics had little meaning save the riot of town and gown. They were generally men of rank in Church or State, men who could not afford to be outlawed. Now in Italy, as in ancient Greece, the citizens of one town had no civil rights in another. The students, therefore, of Bologna found themselves compelled to form themselves into a guild, not so much to defend, like the "masters" of Paris, their educational rights against the chancellor,

much less to resist the encroachments of their lay teachers, as with the object of creating an artificial citizenship which should save them from the perils of the alien.

To the reader, acquainted only with universities formed on the model of Paris, a "university of students" will seem an extraordinary anomaly. It may be of interest, therefore, to note the development of this rival type. The Guild of Foreign Students at Bologna did not at first seek a charter any more than an international rowing club at Oxford. Like any other club, they passed their own rules, none of which had legal validity. But by threats of migration they wrung the recognition of these by-laws as statutes, binding alike on citizen and student. By judicious boycotting they also acquired control of all matters relating to landlords, and over all tradesmen engaged in the production of books. By slow steps we see the power of their "rector" or head expanding until he was formally recognised as ranking in Bologna above all cardinals and archbishops. Two liveried servants testified to his dignity, while during his year of office he could on no account leave the city without giving security for his return. At his inauguration he must provide a banquet for all the students, the wine at which must be of a

certain quality. Another expense was a tournament, for which he furnished two hundred spears. But if the financial burdens of the rector were excessive, the powers he wielded were almost unlimited. All doctors were compelled to swear obedience to the regulations of the Student University. If a professor desired leave of absence, he must obtain it from his pupils; if through lack of ability he failed to draw five to his lectures, he was treated as absent and heavily fined; a weapon of use against other than incapable teachers. He was fined also if not punctual, or failed to finish to the tick of the clock. To postpone a difficulty to the end of a lecture, when opportunity of heckling could not be given, was an unpardonable offence. The law texts were divided into portions called *puncta*, and a time-table made to which the doctor must keep. Nevertheless, such was the reputation of a "master" of Bologna, so valuable also the emoluments, that we find no lack of candidates. Space forbids us from entering into details of the "rigorous and tremendous examination," and the ceremonial whereby he was made free of the Doctors' Guild: how he delivered his thesis in the cathedral, how the gold ring was put on his finger, and the book of the law into his hands,

how he was then escorted through the town in triumph, preceded by the three university pipers and the four university trumpeters, and how he ended the day by giving a banquet to his colleagues, not forgetting the students.

Whether the "university" was a guild of masters or of students, its freedom was won by the same means. Our universities rest for their privileges and immunities on the new power that was sapping feudalism and destroying tyranny—the power of the purse. The schools of Bologna and Paris brought in no small gain to the craftsmen of those cities; neither magistrates nor court dare do anything that would drive them away. In vain did the authorities seek by various devices to crush the guilds, and as a first step to take away the right of migration. Such measures were wholly inoperative, for the "university" had neither buildings¹ nor wealth nor other hostages of fortune. Its sole

¹ Buildings belonged to the college, etc., as at Oxford or Cambridge to-day. The college system once existed in nearly every university of Europe. Paris alone had over sixty. For the origin of that system see the many excellent histories of Oxford or Cambridge, or Rashdall. From the standpoint of the ecclesiastical historian the chief interest of the system lies in its hold of "livings," a practice begun by Walter de Merton, but almost unknown out of England. The consequences of this have been very great.

property, the common chest and seal, was kept in the sacristy of some friendly convent; for its "congregations" it would borrow a neighbouring church. With these powers of flight its wings could not be clipped, more especially as every city of Europe would have welcomed with valuable charters such profitable guests. Universities, in fact, fattened upon their misfortunes; riots generally ended in new charters and further powers; "migrations"¹ in triumphant returns with sheafs of bulls and privileges.

In the rise of the universities the student can discern medieval internationalism strangely blended with the growing consciousness of the new nationalism that proved so fatal to the Papacy (c. viii., s. 2). Of these two forces we have a striking illustration in the history of Prague. Up to the middle of the fourteenth century Germany possessed no university at all. Through political causes German scholars were chiefly attracted by the study of law. They therefore crossed the Alps to Bologna, where their special privileges gave rise to the system

¹ To the frequent "migrations" Europe owes the majority of her older universities. Oxford (probably) by a migration from Paris about 1169; a brawl at Oxford in 1209 led to a migration to Cambridge. Similar migrations to Reading, Stamford, and Northampton unfortunately ended in failures.

of "nations." With the loss of Italy, Germany realised that the old internationalism of letters would no longer supply her needs. So in 1347 Charles IV. founded the university of Prague. There from the very first the new nationalism manifested itself in constant quarrels between the Czechs and Germans. Whatever opinion was embraced by the Teutons was sufficient reason for its rejection by the Czechs. The Teutons were nominalists; the Czechs must needs be the champions of realism. When therefore, in 1403, the doctrines of the realist Wyclif were defended by the realist rector, John Hus, the Germans flung themselves into the defence of Rome with all the ardour begotten of national hatred and the *odium philosophicum*. The end of internationalism was seen when, in 1409, the Germans at Prague, to the number of five thousand,¹ migrated in a body and founded the strictly Teutonic university of Leipzig. The old cosmopolitan life, the brilliance of which was due to the consciousness of unity and solidarity, had given place to the new national

¹ The numbers as a rule have been greatly exaggerated. Wyclif speaks of 'once sixty thousand students' at Oxford. Probably even at Paris the students were never more than six thousand. By 1438 they had fallen off at Oxford to a thousand, a number still further reduced by the Reformation. See the full discussion in Rashdall, ii. c. 13.

spirit so triumphant in the Reformation. Henceforth every separate state sought to establish its own universities, and by pains and penalties to forbid its students from journeying to foreign centres.

II

We have dwelt at some length on the rise of the universities, for their importance in the development of the Church cannot be exaggerated. In all ages universities have been the great home of "movements"; and the part they have played in both Reform and Reaction needs neither illustration nor proof. There are, however, certain points which the student should note.

So much capital has been made of the supposed "religious atmosphere" of the medieval universities that it is necessary to nail down the fiction once for all. We owe it to the Reformation and the Catholic Reaction that the universities of Europe became the strict preserves of orthodoxy, fenced round with tests and oaths. The universities of the Middle Ages were far more "the schools of the modern spirit" than seminaries of the Church. By this we do not mean that in medieval universities room was made for

"the conscientious objections" of Dissenters. The unity of the Church was still unbroken, Dissent unknown; while every detail of life, whether in the market-place or the school, was regarded as connected with religion. Nevertheless, the universities were in a real sense "the protest of the lay spirit." Of special religious instruction they provided for the "artist" absolutely nothing. Until 1352 there were only two universities of Europe at which it was possible to obtain a degree in theology. So far were the popes from displaying any anxiety to extend "religious education" that they were the most zealous defenders of this monopoly of Paris and Oxford. In the law universities of Italy the teachers were laymen. As for the universities of Southern France, the object was strictly commercial. Languedoc, before the Albigensian Crusade, was the richest district of Europe, its cities numerous and wealthy, their trade far-reaching. Now, before the modern applications of mathematics to mechanism, there was no branch of knowledge that had a better commercial value than medicine. Hence the rise of Montpellier as the great medical school of Europe, whose statutes provided for 'at least one anatomy in two years.' Even in Paris

the theological faculty sought rather unto Aristotle and his Arabic interpreters than to Augustine and the Fathers.

The consequences of this "lay spirit" were twofold. In Italy and Spain theology was abandoned to the Mendicants. Reform was thus cut off from its intellectual roots; a religious awakening cannot be built up on a secular foundation. Only in the theological universities of Oxford and Paris do we find voices raised against the Papacy, and organised attempts to correct abuses. Only in these two universities do we see fulfilled the two necessary conditions of every successful religious movement, "an intellectual current from above uniting itself with a moral current from below." No doubt the popes had taken care to capture the universities by an ingenious system of patronage; thus emphasising their dependence upon Rome for their privileges. But the most successful muzzle that the Papacy placed upon Reform was the secular character of the usual university education. The study of Canon Law heralds no revolution. It aims rather at stiffening the existing, than realising the ideal. Thus no religious movement was ever begun in an Italian university. On the contrary, Paris became the stronghold of Gallican

liberties, "a sort of standing committee of the French Church" which in the fourteenth century sought even to control the Papacy.

If the direct influence in reform of the medieval universities was slight, nevertheless their "secular spirit" indirectly paved the way for the great revolution. They opened out to democracy other avenues of advancement than the Church; they delivered the mind from the swaddling-clothes of centuries. Hitherto the culture of the soul had been the exclusive object of human interest and care. This had led, by the usual rule, to a dwarfing of the soul itself. Now man was waking to the consciousness of himself, and of the place that he held in nature. The consequence in time, when the first burst of scepticism was exhausted, was a deeper religious movement. When man realised at last that the world was a work of God, and as such was very good, the doom was writ not only of monasticism, but of much else in the Latin Church.

III

From the outer history of the universities we now turn to their teaching. The reader will not expect any sketch, even in barest outline, of the fortunes of scholasticism, nor

a survey of the divergent schools. For these he must have resort to the recognised text-books of philosophy. We can only indicate the main features of medieval thought which affected the development of the Church.

The student should notice the change from the early scholasticism, whose typical figure was Abailard, to the later scholasticism, with its five great doctors of the Church.¹ The early scholasticism was full of daring speculation; the later was rigidly orthodox. In reality it was not so much scholasticism that had changed as the attitude towards it of the Church. To Bernard the attempt to exercise human reason in matters of religion seemed impious beyond words. But though in his struggle with Abailard he seemed to have come off the victor, in reality he had failed. Within a generation of his death

¹ Alexander of Hales (in Gloucestershire), the Irrefragable Doctor (d. 1245), of whose ponderous *Summa* Bacon writes, 'quae est plus quam pondus unius equi.' John Fidanza, or Bonaventura (d. 1274), the Seraphic. Albertus Magnus (d. 1280), the Universal. His life covered nearly a century, and both as Doctor at Cologne and Bishop of Ratisbon was a marvel of thoroughness. Thomas Aquinas, his pupil (1224-1274), Doctor Angelic; and John Duns Scotus (d. 1308), the Subtle Doctor—the great rival of Thomas, who is said to have died at thirty-four, having finished his thirteen huge folio volumes. William of Ockham belongs to a later age. Avicenna died in Spain in 1036; Averrhoës in 1198.

the new universities, with truer insight than Bernard, gradually adopted into their authoritative theology the very system which Bernard had denounced. Thus in one sense the early and later scholasticism are continuous; their real divergence lies elsewhere. The early schoolmen pushed out to sea not knowing whither the tide and winds might drive them; the later doctors steered by compass, and were under a pilot. That pilot was Aristotle; their compass his Logic.

There is nothing in the history of thought more remarkable than the rapidity with which Aristotle in the thirteenth century captured the Church. At the beginning of that century the whole of his works—previously only known in fragments, and held secondary to Plato—were gradually making their way into the Western world, in part through intercourse with the Moors of Spain, in part through the Crusades, in part through the Latin conquest of Constantinople. The new Aristotle was at first regarded by the Church with suspicion and dread. His introduction had led to an outburst of scepticism; his Arab interpreters, Avicenna and Averrhoës, threatened to sweep men away from their moorings into vasty deeps of pantheism. The intellect of men seemed intoxicated with

the new powers which the method of Aristotle had revealed. Reality became secondary to syllogistic smartness. We read, for instance, of a certain Parisian master, Simon de Tournai, who defended the doctrine of the Trinity 'so elegantly, so lucidly, so catholicly,' that thunders of applause greeted his performance. At once he announced that he could demolish with equal plausibility the faith that he had that day maintained. Matthew of Paris tells of the stroke of paralysis which punished his blasphemy, how 'with difficulty the famous doctor relearned in time from his own child his *Credo* and his *Paternoster*.' But the dangerous influences of Averrhoistic pantheism soon passed away. Men were too profoundly anxious to reduce into intelligibleness the doctrines which they believed, to follow the crude speculations of Amalric of Bena (1207) or David of Dinant.

The great object of the thirteenth-century thinkers was the adjustment of the theology of the Church to human consciousness, no longer like Anselm by *à priori* speculations, or like the mystics by "contemplation," but by a scientific and logical system ('*summa*.'), in which all the forces of mind should do homage to the Church. With that wonderful intuition which has so rarely deserted her the Latin Church saw in

Aristotle the instrument she needed. She felt that if reason and authority are to be made one there must be a pope in philosophy as well as in theology. For this end Rome went contrary to her former infallible judgments. In 1209 the use of Aristotle had been officially condemned 'until the works shall have been examined and purged from all heresy.' Thirty years later Aristotle became the official textbook of the Latin Church, his authority final in almost every branch of knowledge. For his sake also the great Arabic and Jewish commentators were no longer treated as heretics and atheists; their theories were examined, their arguments discussed. Dante, the faithful exponent of Thomas Aquinas, even places Averrhoës and Avicenna in the circle of those who only needed baptism in order to be saved.

In her exaltation of Aristotle into the new dictator of reason the Latin Church not only went back on her own decisions, but cut herself off from the general philosophic drift of the early Church. To the early fathers Aristotle seemed "a profane intruder, bringing the noisy jargon of the world into a sanctuary where every thought and feeling should be hushed in holy contemplation" (Hampden). Until Augustine gave to the theology of the West

that peculiar forensic bent which it still retains, the thought of the Church had been moulded, broadly considered, on the lines of Plato, with a certain leaven of Stoic influence. The Eastern fathers, under the commanding influence of Clement and Origen, turned their religion into a metaphysical theology, the woof and web of which were the terms and ideas of neo-Platonism. But the Aristotle whom the East had neglected became the great Father of the Latin Church.

For this change from Plato to Aristotle there were other reasons than the accident of his new discovery. In every age the study of Plato has tended in a twofold direction. His doctrine of the immanence of God is the basis of all mysticism, while his dreams of ideal beauty and perfection lead to dissatisfaction with things as they are. Aristotle, on the contrary, has been called "the high priest of common sense." The last charge that could be brought against him is mysticism, for his "final appeal is always to man's natural reason."¹ While Plato "points the way to a world where things correspond to the perfection of their original divine idea," the tendency of Aristotle is to concentrate thought on existing institutions.

¹ Brewer, *Mon. Fran.*, p. liii. of his Preface.

This it was that commended him to the busy spirit of the Latin Churchmen. For the Church of the West in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was profoundly satisfied that her institution was part of the eternal fitness and order of the universe. For the speculations of the East she cared nothing; the centre of her theology was not so much God as man, his state and constitution, his relations and duties. And in this theology of man the central idea was the *Civitas Dei*, that spiritualised empire and organisation, which "named the name of Christ, but whose form was the form of Cæsar." Its continuous and comprehensive existence was the first axiom of truth. By this she demonstrated her correspondence with the Divine Ideal; nor was she disturbed in this self-complacency by the ideal yearnings of the mystics or the angry outbursts of the discontented.

Of this clerical self-satisfaction, which demanded adjustment not progress, dialectics not metaphysics, Aristotle was the natural prophet. "If Churches always canonised their benefactors, he would long ago have been at the head of the Roman calendar. There were many schoolmen, but they all had one master, and they built by his help and to his honour

systems that even he would have acknowledged to be encyclopædic and marvels of architectonic craft.”¹ Their aim was to exhibit the unity in thought of reason and authority; of the papal Church and its sacerdotal theology. Thus the Papacy and scholasticism grew strong and decayed together. The forces that dissolved the one disintegrated the other, leaving behind the ponderous tomes in our libraries which, like the tombstones of our cemeteries, speak only of departed reputations.

Yet one reputation can never die. For the student of Church history it is all-important that he realise the vast significance of the teaching of the greatest of the schoolmen.² “The world-historical importance of Thomas Aquinas lies in his uniting of Augustine and Aristotle” (Harnack). We would add a third name, the Pseudo-Dionysius. In Augustine, whose formulas are full of contradictions, Rome had ever recognised the champion of her faith, though careful to crush those who, like Gottschalk, should emphasise his Predestinarian errors.

¹ Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 119. The whole chapter should be studied.

² The best illustration of the importance of Aquinas is that the catalogue under his name in the British Museum extends to over fifty pages!

By the use of Aristotle Aquinas undertook to eliminate difficulties, and obtain an homogeneous creed appealing alike to reason and faith. Needless to say, from the nature of the case, the new Augustine was not able to create a satisfactory unity. So Bradwardine, Wyclif, and Hus began that return to Augustine, and the neglected Pauline side of his teaching, which the Reformers of the sixteenth century completed in their different ways, not always, be it remarked, to the advantage of a spiritual and primitive Christianity. But we are anticipating. "The work which Aquinas did for the Church of his day—the fusion of the highest speculative thought of the time with its profoundest spiritual convictions, the reconciliation of the new truths of the present with the kernel of truth embodied in the traditional creed—is a task which will have to be done again and again so long as the human mind continues progressive, and religion remains a vital force with it. It will have to be done in a different spirit, by different methods, and with very different results from those of the *Summa*. But in one respect the work of Aquinas is built on the solid foundation upon which all such efforts must repose—the grand conviction that religion is rational and that reason is

divine, and that all knowledge and all truth must be capable of harmonious adjustment.”¹

¹ Rashdall, *op. cit.* i. 367, ii. 540. Allen, *Continuity Christian Thought*, pp. 223-237. For Dionysius, see vol. i. 222, ii. p. 201. For Augustine, see Harnack, Allen, *Continuity*, or Banks, *Development of Doctrine*, pp. 139-201.

CHAPTER VIII

BONIFACE VIII. AND CLEMENT V

*Lo! the flower-de-luce
Enters Alagna! in his Vicar Christ
Himself a captive, and his mockery
Acted again! Lo! to his holy lip
The vinegar and gall once more applied!
And he 'twixt living robbers doom'd to bleed!
Lo the new Pilate, of whose cruelty
Such violence cannot fill the measure up,
With no decree to sanction, pushes on
Into the Temple his yet eager sails.*

PURG., c. xx. 84-94.

AUTHORITIES.—§ 1. GREGOROVIVS (especially for Italy). MILMAN. ROCQUAIN, *La Papauté au M. A.* (Four discriminating studies of Nicholas I., Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII.) Read also WISEMAN, *Boniface VIII.*, in his *Essays*, vol. iii., for the other side. Throughout this section the reader must be on his guard for distortions by party spirit. This especially applies to the French historians of Philip (MARTIN, etc.). For the *Clericis Laicos*, *Unam Sanctam*, see translation in HENDERSON, *S. D.* The *Clericis Laicos*, *Mortmain*, and other documents connected with England, are translated in GEE and HARDY, 81-95. For England, STUBBS should not be neglected by those who desire to understand the great change in national life and its consequences for Rome. The legal relations of England and Scotland are dealt with in FREEMAN, *Essays*, vol. ii.

§ 2. For the Templars I have followed LEA, *Inquis.*, iii. 238-334. For the "laborious trifling" of MIGNARD, PRUTZ, etc., against Schottmüller, see *ib.* 265, n.; also MILMAN, vii. 277, 278, n. GMELIN, *Schuld oder Unschuld des Tempelordens* is said to be a good résumé of the question, but I have seen no reason to doubt Lea's trained judgment and exhaustive investigation. Many of our difficulties arise from the sale of the original documents to the Paris grocers in the days of the Revolution.

For other books bearing on this section, see p. 299 n. The view the reader takes will depend on his answer to the question raised by MAITLAND, *Canon Law in the Church of England*.

BONIFACE VIII. AND CLEMENT V

I

IN the year 1300—the last year as it proved not only of a century but of an entire epoch of history—Dante and Villani were pacing the streets of Rome gazing at the marvellous picture before them. Every day thirty thousand pilgrims poured into the city and hastened to St. Peter's. So great was the crush that the bridge of St. Angelo had been divided by a line of booths to regulate the traffic. In St. Paul's two priests stood night and day by the altar raking in the offerings of the people. The crowning glory was reached when the Pope showed himself to the pilgrims—so runs the story, of value even if untrue—seated on his throne, arrayed with the sword and crown of Constantine, and shouting, "I am Cæsar, I am Emperor." Never since the days of the Cæsars had the city so throbbed with the life and stir of multitudes from every nation of Europe. For Boniface VIII. had proclaimed the remission

of sins to all who should visit the tombs of the apostles during the year of Jubilee.¹ Christendom hastened to respond. She had lost the Sepulchre of the Saviour, but Rome, holy Rome, was still left unto her. There was the seat of the Vicar of God; there the tombs of the martyrs and saints; there also the priceless relics of faith. Rome still ruled the souls and bodies of men.

Sixty-seven years later Urban v. re-entered the city to which for years its bishops had been strangers. He found her population sunk to twenty thousand, her churches burnt, her streets deserted. So dreary was the desolation, so hopeless their prospects, that after three years of exile Urban and his cardinals fled back to the flesh-pots of Avignon and the protection of the French king. The Papacy had fallen from its giddy and untenable height; a fall that by its rapidity and completeness seemed to come as the bolt from heaven without cause or warning.

In their fierce hatred of the Empire the popes had summoned to their aid the forces of a stranger. Charles of Anjou obeyed the call, and in their name overthrew Manfred (1266), crushed the efforts of the Hohenstaufen, and

¹ For Jubilees and their later development, see the full treatment in Lea, *Auricular Confession*, iii. c. 4.

executed Conradin on the scaffold at Naples (1268). The last heir of the great Swabians had perished, the last foothold of the Empire was destroyed; the popes expected to step into the vacant place. They found instead that they had created the Frankenstein who should prove their ruin. They had become mere puppets (1261–1292) elected to carry out the wishes of the French king of Sicily.¹

On the death of Charles—whose hopes were destroyed by the famous massacre of the Sicilian Vespers (1282)—the Papacy became the sport of the two great factions of Rome, the Orsini and Colonna. In 1292 the death of Nicholas IV. found the cardinals—but twelve in all—so equally divided that for two years no election was possible. At last the fear of schism led to their election, in a spasm of weariness, of Peter the son of a peasant of the Abruzzi, a holy hermit who had founded a monastery of fanatics (*Celestines*), followers really of Joachim di Fiori, on the slopes of Murrone. The messengers of the conclave toiled up the

¹ Note that Adrian V. (1276) was never consecrated priest, though he issued decrees whose authority is recognised. Those who have interest, which I confess I have not, in polemics of this sort will find them at length in Littledale's *The Petrine Claim*, to my mind a *reductio ad absurdum*.

mountain to the anchorite's cave; and through the barred window beheld the Pope elect with his sunken eyes, his unkempt beard, his body wasted with privations and torture. The cardinals entered and prostrated themselves before him. Petrarch relates that he attempted flight; he thought the deputation one of his hallucinations. He was caught by the crowd and carried to the cathedral of Aquila. There the crown of the Gregories and Innocents was thrust upon him. Two hundred thousand spectators testified to the joy of the people that the chair of St. Peter was once more filled by a saint after their own heart.

The expectations of the Spiritual Franciscans were boundless; but the rule of this child of nature was a terrible failure. From the first Celestine v. was a tool in the hands of the French. He detained the Papacy in Naples, filled the College with their nominees, and hid himself for Advent in a cell. There alone could he be at peace from the tortures of his office. The Curia determined to procure his abdication; they heard that he intended to put the Papacy in commission. Cardinal Gaetani, so ran the popular though doubtful story, undertook to avert this danger, and borrowed a speaking-trumpet. In the dead of night a voice from

heaven summoned Celestine to renounce the Papacy—a step hitherto unknown in its annals, and contrary to its principles of a direct commission from heaven. The tortured imbecile fancied he heard the call of God, and in spite of the fury of the people he pronounced valid in public consistory the abdication of a pope. Then the infallible Vicar of God acknowledged before all his incapacity and mistakes, stripped himself of his purple, and joyfully donned once more the coarse gown of his brotherhood. He would return from the pinnacle of the world to the hunger and thirst and hallucinations of his cave. But Gaetani, his successor, shut him up in the castle of Fumone. There in a dungeon narrower than his former cell he died, mourned by the people as a martyr, canonised by the French popes as a saint, but consigned by Dante to the circles of hell where dwell the ignoble spirits ‘whom mercy and justice scorn.’ This was his punishment for having made ‘the great refusal’ of reforming the Church of God. ‘What wilt thou do, Peter Murrone, now thou art on thy trial?’ sang also the enthusiastic Jacopone da Todi. For Jacopone (p. 228 n.) and the Spiritual Franciscans were waiting for the triumph of *The Everlasting Gospel*. In Celestine they had found their Pope Angelico, who

should undo the fatal gift of Constantine, and bring back the 'age of lilies.' But Celestine had done nothing save make it clear "that the Papacy had become a great political institution, whose spiritual significance had merged in its political importance" (Creighton).

Boniface VIII., the successor of Celestine, though a man of blameless morals, was no saint, but a man of consummate political genius. His real greatness is often forgotten in our contempt of his avarice and pride. His ideal was that of Hildebrand, his methods were borrowed from Innocent. He determined to free the Papacy from its French fetters. Once more Rome should rule the nations with a rod of iron. But Boniface was blind to the signs of the times. He could not discern that ideal and methods alike belonged to a past age.

The deeds of Boniface—his attempts to restore order in Italy, his founding of the ducal house of Sermoneta by gifts of over a million sterling to his nephew, his remorseless crusade against the great Ghibelline house of the Colonna, the slavish submission of the one-eyed Albert of Hapsburg—need not here concern us. He will be for ever remembered not for his successes, important as they were, but for his fall. That great event of world-history came about in this

wise. Boniface had begun his reign by calling on the monarchs of Europe to settle their differences by arbitration at his court. His real object was not so much the peace of Christendom as by this means to fish in troubled waters. But in Edward I. of England and Philip le Bel of France Boniface had to deal with two monarchs neither of whom were willing to forego their quarrels at the order of a pope, or admit his claims to temporal supremacy. Conflict was inevitable. Both Edward and Philip aimed at the consolidation of their monarchy; the one by suppressing the vassal kings of Wales and Scotland, the other by acquiring the continental domains of England; the one by developing a balanced constitutional government, the other by erecting a centralised absolute monarchy. Both found that they must deal first with the *imperium in imperio*, the State within their State, the uncontrolled lord of which was the Pope.

The ostensible ground of quarrel was finance. Edward and Philip had determined to make the Church contribute its share of taxation; a measure absolutely necessary for the consolidation of their realms. The growing power of the Crown and the constant wars involved growing expense, while the sources of revenue were becoming

exhausted by the "dead hand" of the Church, and the loss through popular fanaticism of the treasures of the Jews. In England Edward found that half the knights' fees which had contributed their assessment to the conqueror had now passed into the grasp of clergy or monk. The statute of Mortmain (1279) was not passed a year too soon. Further alienation was forbidden, while Edward cast around for means of undoing the mischief of the past. In France the insatiable rapacity of Philip needed no incentive; it was sufficient that his rival had found a new source of revenue. Philip was driven in self-defence to follow suit.

Boniface took up the gauntlet. In the famous bull, *Clericis Laicos* (1296), he declared that monarchs had no right to exact taxes or aids from their clergy, even in the shape of voluntary grants, without the sanction of the Holy Father. Edward retorted by a general outlawry of the whole order; their horses were seized, their tithe-barns closed. Philip's answer was the prohibition of the export of precious metals, thus cutting off from the Pope the fees of the Curia and the contributions of the faithful. In both countries the royal power won. The clergy, in fact, felt that there was little to choose between the exactions of Pope or King;

of the two the King's was the less capricious. So they thanked the Pope for his care of their liberties, but deprecated further interference lest it should disturb the peace. Boniface yielded, issued a bull which explained away his claims, and canonised Philip's grandfather, Louis ix.

The Pope had one great success, besides the Jubilee, before his final fall. A quarrel arose between Edward and Philip, the cause of which was the English alliance with Flanders. But the resources of the kings were exhausted; both wished to withdraw with credit. So they appealed to the arbitration of Rome, not of the Pope, but to Boniface as a private individual, Benedetto Gaetani by name. The distinction was subtle but valueless. The world saw only two great kings at the feet of the Pope, who announced his award in full synod at Rome, with the penalties of interdict and excommunication against the disobedient (1298). But the victory was speedily followed by a reverse. In 1299 Scotland appealed to Boniface against the conquests of Edward. They demanded the protection of the Church; they were, they said, a fief of St. Peter. The Pope took up the challenge, claimed Scotland as his own, and summoned Edward to submit his quarrel to his determination. The Parliament of Lincoln (1301) replied that 'they would

not permit our lord the King, even if he should so design, to comply, or attempt compliance, with demands so unprecedented and unlawful.'

Boniface was deaf to the significance of this warning. In the meantime he had become involved in a more serious breach with Philip: The apparent causes of the quarrel seem trivial; in reality it was the last struggle of irreconcilable principles. Compromise was no longer possible; the battle for supremacy must be fought to the end. A petty strife over vacant benefices, the arrest of an insolent legate, widened out into a conflict without quarter. But the *vae victis* was sung over the bishops of Rome, not the rulers of the new nations. For Boniface was blind to the signs of the times. In bull after bull he asserted his supremacy over all temporal governments. 'The spiritual and the temporal sword'—so runs the famous *Unam Sanctam* (Nov. 1302)—'are alike under the control of the Church. The temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual. From henceforth we declare and pronounce that it is necessary to salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff.'¹ Philip retorted

¹ The *Unam Sanctam* (see "Authorities") should be compared with the (reputed) *Dictatus Hildebrandi* (Döberl, iii. § 6). There was really little in it that was new. It made

by burning the bull *Ausculda Fili* before the Notre Dame (Feb. 1302), and summoned the nation to his aid. By his creation of Parliaments the English king had discovered the strength of the future; Philip, hitherto an imperious tyrant, was driven by his necessities into copying his example. The first meeting of the Estates General in the Louvre (June 1303) is as historic an event as the first burning of a papal bull in the previous year. Both proclaimed the dawn of a new day, the rise of a new power.

The appeal of the King met with the response he desired. The first national Parliament of France arraigned the Pope at its bar, accused Boniface of heresy and impossible crimes,—the catalogue reads like a fragment from the *Arabian Nights*, with its story of a spirit enclosed in a ring,¹—and ominously appealed to a General Council of the Church. Boniface retorted with solemn excommunications and threats of deposition—explicit what was implicit. How completely the *Dictate* still governs the R. Church may be gathered from the famous clause, ‘Quod catholicus non habeatur, qui non concordat Romanæ ecclesiæ.’ I cannot agree with those who claim that papal infallibility is a recent discovery. It forms the groundwork of the medieval Papacy, as the reader of the *Dictatus* will observe. Cf. Innocent III.’s inaugural sermon.

¹ See the astonishing arraignment of the dead Boniface at Vienne (1311), well told by Milman. Clement by throwing over the Templars just saved the Papacy from this crowning ruin.

tion. But his weapons had become blunt with centuries of use. Meanwhile, William de Nogaret, a doctor of law from Toulouse, and the exiled Sciarra Colonna, undertook to make the Pope a prisoner, and bring him before a Council at Lyons. The barons of the Campagna, groaning under the nepotism of Boniface, entered heartily into the conspiracy. The Pope had retired to his native Anagni. There, on September 8, he intended to pronounce the deposition of Philip in the same cathedral in which his predecessors had excommunicated the great Hohenstaufen. But on September 6, in the early dawn, the conspirators surrounded the palace of the Pope. With cries of "Death to Pope Boniface!" they unfolded the banner of France. For three days the old man was subject to the insults and violence of the mercenaries, who knew not what to do with their prisoner. On the fourth day he was rescued, and returned to Rome. There he shut himself up in the Vatican, his spirit tortured by his desire for revenge and consciousness of powerlessness. In the bitterness of his fall he lost his reason. He refused food, 'he believed that every one who came near him would take him to prison.' On the thirty-fifth day he was found dead upon his bed (Oct. 1303). He had

died of a broken heart. The famous prophecy that men ascribed to Celestine was fulfilled: Boniface had 'entered like a fox, reigned like a lion, died like a dog.' The hatred of Dante had consigned him in his lifetime to the hell where dwelt 'with burning soles' the wretched followers of Simon Magus:

Ha! already standest there?
Already standest there, O Boniface?
By many a year the writing played me false.
So early dost thou surfeit with the wealth,
For which thou fearedst not in guile to take
The lovely lady, and then mangle her?

Boniface perished not alone in his ambition. In his grave was buried the Hildebrandine Papacy; Anagni stands over against Canossa and Dover. The spell of the past was broken; new forces had arisen which Rome could neither understand nor destroy. Benedict XI., the successor of Boniface, was wise enough to recognise his powerlessness. Instead of excommunicating Philip and canonising a greater martyr than Becket, he meekly reversed Boniface's decrees. The Papacy capitulated to the secular power. The next Pope, Clement v. (1305), was a Gascon, the tool and nominee of Philip.¹ His first act was to transfer the

¹ But I do not believe the familiar story of the interview of the King and Clement in the forest of St. Jean d'Angely, and

Papacy to Bordeaux, then Avignon. There for seventy-three years it remained in its "Babylonish Captivity," under the protection of the kings of France, while Christendom slowly woke up to the irreparable ruin of the dreams of Hildebrand. The first result was a complete decadence. To turn from the thirteenth century to the fourteenth is to pass from the joyousness of spring into November fogs. In all Europe, except Italy, the fourteenth century was a period of weary reaction and stagnation. Thought lost its vigour, art was dying, poetry was mute, development was checked. It was the age of the Black Death. For two centuries the Papacy struggled on, helpless, discredited; its sole strength, that its final fall would have ruined much else beside. The greed of Avignon estranged all, while her subjection to France was seen to be an intolerable anomaly. "Men felt," writes Bishop Creighton, "that the old landmarks were passing away, but did not yet see what was to take their place." The irresistible time current was sweeping men away the bargain of six conditions, the unknown sixth being the suppression of the Templars. See Lea, iii. 258, n. The life and death of Boniface are full of the tales born of strong popular passion. Note that Clement, though a Frenchman, was a subject of Edward I., to whom he showed himself even a more obsequious vassal than to his suzerain France.

from their old moorings into regions of new thought. Hitherto in every movement there had lurked the spirit of Hildebrand; now all things wearily waited for a new prophet. At last the fullness of times was accomplished. The failure of Wyclif and Constance made men turn for their deliverance to more daring proposals. First the Renaissance, then Luther, made articulate the cry of new hopes. But in the fall of Boniface we mark the real beginning of that complex change in the life and creed of Europe to which men have given, somewhat loosely, the name of the Reformation.

II

We purpose in our remaining pages to examine the causes of the papal fall. In so doing we shall briefly indicate the general part that Rome has played in the evolution of history.

The student entering upon the inquiry should realise at the outset that the medieval Church was not so much a Church, in the modern or scriptural sense of the word, as a State. "Convenience," writes Professor Maitland, "may forbid us to call it a State very often, but we ought to do so from time to time, for we could frame no acceptable definition of a State which would not comprehend the Church. What has it not that

the State should have? It has laws, lawgivers, law courts, lawyers. It uses physical force to compel men to obey its laws. It keeps prisons. In the thirteenth century, though with squeamish phrases, it pronounces sentence of death. It is no voluntary society. If people attempt to leave it, they are guilty of the *crimen læsæ majestatis*, and are likely to be burnt. It is supported by involuntary contributions, by tithe and tax. That men believe it to have a supernatural origin does not alter the case. Kings have reigned by divine right, and republics have been founded in the name of God-given liberty.”¹ But the constitution of this State was unique in one all-important respect. This was a State within a State, a State which had neither boundaries nor limits; which existed in, was part of, and yet distinct from every other State, over the which in fact it claimed priority and pre-eminence.

Herein will be found the secret both of the growth and downfall of the papal supremacy. The patriarchate of Rome became the supreme power in the medieval world, because Western Europe had been cradled in the belief of the necessity of one world-power, to which all other powers should give adherence and form a part. To this legacy of the Cæsars the popes had

¹ Maitland, *Canon Law in Church of England*, p. 100.

become the heirs. Amid the chaos and welter of the great upheaval they alone had offered a unity of administration and law. They had won the gratitude of Europe by never flinching from their task of beating down anarchy into order, and asserting the supremacy of moral ideas over brute force. Thus they stood for the solidarity of Europe in one world-state. The downfall was due to the same cause. Men did not throw over the yoke of Boniface because they had ceased to believe in the Pope's spiritual pretensions. The revolt was political, not religious; social, not moral; a protest against an all-centralised yet omnipresent world-power, in theory spiritual, in practice secular, which had outlived the conditions of its birth. The imperial idea, which originated with Alexander, but was completed by the Cæsars, was at last exhausted. World-wide administrative centralisation, whether secular or spiritual, had ceased to be the ideal. "The building up of the nation had begun to be revealed as the goal of history."¹

The Papacy was the child of imperial Rome;

¹ Allen, *Christian Institutions*, p. 225. The whole of his cc. 10 and 11 are worth reading for their emphasis of "nationality"; as also Church, *Influence of Christianity upon National Character*. Mulford, *The Nation*, is very prolix.

by birth and instinct, therefore, a danger to the independence of the nations. She had inherited Rome's fatal power of absorbing the vanquished and destroying their individual genius. In her earlier years she had not to struggle with nationalism in the State, so far, that is, as Western Europe was concerned, for the nation as distinct from the tribe did not yet exist. A hollow imperialism played into her hands. When the empire of Charles broke up into fragments, each of which, like the lower organisms, was for ever dividing and subdividing, the Roman bishop became master of the situation. Such nationalism as she had to meet was rather within the Church than without; the tendency of sees like Milan, Bremen, Canterbury, or Rheims to turn the Church into a federal republic. At length the battle was won, and the metropolitan sees of the West reduced into mere parts of one great autocratic and centralised empire. Then Rome found that her victory had transferred the struggle to a more dangerous field. For the Middle Ages proved to be not only the burial-ground of secular imperialism, but the nursery of a new nationalism. The kingdoms of Western Europe had arisen to challenge the root-ideas of papal power.

The inevitable collision of the two ideas may

be variously illustrated. We have already noted this result in the sphere of law (p. 128 f.). By the opening years of the fourteenth century statesmen had discovered that between an omniscient court of appeal at Rome and the growing powers of the King's Bench at Westminster or the Parliament of Paris there could be no compromise. The one must destroy the other. The nations had become conscious of the upas growth which stunted their legal and civil development. The axe was laid at the root of the tree; time only was needed for its downfall.

Then, again, the student should note that the fall of the Papacy coincides with the fall of the great medieval anti-national or international institutions; monasticism, the friars, and the military orders. In these the Papacy had found her strength; in the hours of weakness they had saved her. Of the three the monasteries were the oldest and wealthiest. Their emancipation by the fiat of successive popes from the control of the bishop had made them in every land the zealous dependants and champions of the Papacy; while their wealth had cut them off from their former care for local interests. But their life was ebbing away, their work was done. When Boniface fell, Rome looked in vain

to the monasteries to avenge her disgrace. No Bernard stirred the passions of men on her behalf; no new orders rose to her relief; no Dominic marshalled new watch-dogs (*Domini canes*) of the Papacy. Monasticism was intent only on the preservation of its wealth and privileges; the friars in forgetting the rules of their founders. The ideal, in fact, of religious life had changed. The current had set in from the monastery to the rectory. The downfall of the Papacy coincided with a revival of the influence and character of the secular clergy. But the secular clergy, because of their organic connection with the State, have never for long resisted the State, or supported ultramontane pretensions. The anti-nationalism of the regulars is no part of their record or creed.

But the best illustration of the power of the new nationalism will be found in the story of the fall of the famous Templars. For the military orders were strictly the regiments of the Pope, to whom alone their Grand Masters owed service and fealty. Interdicts could not darken the land of Goshen where they dwelt; they were released from all control of bishop or prince. Rome curtained them round with exemptions and immunities, and in return their swords were ever at her service. National ties

they had none; their land was the Church; their prince the Holy Father alone. They paid no taxes. When asked by a king of England for subsidies, they replied that the request might cost him his throne. They were only endured by the new kingdoms because of their service in the Crusades. For the military orders were the sole hope of a distracted Palestine. With the end of the Crusades their end came also. The Hospitallers saved themselves by finding a new field of service; but the Templars were adrift without a purpose, by their wealth and discipline a menace to Europe.

The danger was great. Boniface, acting on a suggestion of Innocent, had proposed the union of the orders into one army of the Papacy. The scheme would have enslaved Europe for centuries. Nationalism and liberty would have been at the mercy of the Janissaries of Rome, who would have added invincible courage to the obedience of Jesuits. Their fall was absolutely necessary if the new nations were to survive; their maintenance should be the first care of the popes. Europe seemed on the eve of a struggle the end of which might seem doubtful when, in the providence of God, Papacy and Templars fell together. The

astounding thing is that their suppression was wrung from the popes themselves. But the puppets at Avignon had no choice. At all costs Philip must crush the mailed hand of the Papacy. So Clement v., at the bidding of France, condemned an order whose greatest crime was unswerving fidelity to Rome. On the 13th of October 1307 the unsuspecting Templars were seized in their beds and handed over to the Inquisition, at the head of which was the confessor and tool of the King. Once in the hands of that tribunal, they were powerless. Some were tortured until they subscribed to the falsest tales, while others more heroic were burnt at the stake. Men marvelled as they beheld the police of the Papacy sacrificing to the cupidity of Pope and King the renowned soldiers of the Church. For seven years the saturnalia of plunder and torture went on in the vain hope of extracting evidence that would justify the deed. At last, in 1314, the farce was ended. The Grand Master, Jacques du Bourg-Molay, was roasted on the island of the Seine 'in the light of the setting sun,' while the bull of Clement proclaiming the suppression of the order and the confiscation of their property was read to the people of Paris. The Papacy, in fact, had suppressed itself by means of its own

Inquisition.¹ Behind du Molay it is Rome that is falling 'in the light of the setting sun.' Nationalism was triumphant; the Hildebrandine dream had vanished. Clement had completed the overthrow that Boniface had begun. The ambition of the one, the weakness, more criminal than wickedness, of the other, had involved the medieval Papacy in disasters from which it has never recovered.

There are other aspects from which the downfall of the Hildebrandine papacy might be viewed. The financial oppression of the Curia, the shameless system of 'provisions,' the tax upon industry of a disproportionate clerical estate, the growing worldliness and greed of the popes, had each played their part in producing the upheaval. The consideration of these abuses will be better postponed until their culmination in the dark days of Avignon. But closely allied with the rise of nationalism was the downfall of the dominant realism. Hitherto it had been an axiom of thought that

¹ The papal Inquisition, as distinct of course from the episcopal, was only once established in England. This was done in order to suppress the English Templars. But in spite of eighteen months' trial no condemnation could be procured; so the Templars were pensioned off on 'fourpence per diem.' See Lea, *op. cit.* iii. 298-301. The papal Inquisition in England was then abolished.

the real must be the universal, just as the universal must be the real. A real Church, and a real State, must be universal, catholic or imperial. Thus realism had found no place for the individual whether in politics or theology. The downfall of realism coincides with the assertion by the separate nations of their reality; the discovery of the individual would follow later.

We must bring our sketch to a close. We have touched merely the fringe of an inexhaustible subject. For the rise and fall of the Roman supremacy is the most wonderful event in history. Who can unfold the true inwardness of that marvellous institution, or lay bare the secrets of its strength, the causes of its decay? "Who can describe that which unites men? Who has entered into the formation of speech which is the symbol of their union? Who can describe exhaustively the origin of civil society?"¹ He who can do these things may perhaps explain the hold of the Papacy in the Middle Ages on the life and intellect of the Church of the West. "Those persons," writes Bryce, "if such there still be, who see in it nothing but a gigantic upas-tree of fraud and superstition, planted and reared by the enemy of mankind, are hardly

¹ *Ecce Homo*, p. 310.

further from entering into the mystery of its being than the complacent political philosopher, who explains in neat phrases the process of its growth, analyses it as a clever piece of mechanism, enumerates and measures the interests it appealed to, and gives in conclusion a sort of tabular view of its results for good and for evil.”¹ For the secret of the medieval Church must always remain unexpressed, since to-day it is incapable of expression.

With all its defects—and the reverse side of the page may well fill us with amazement and indignation—the medieval Church presents a noble spectacle of moral grandeur. Pages of her history are written in letters of living light, of more than golden glory. Where can we point to a self-sacrifice so deep, so abiding, so sacred as that of her sons? Who have ever climbed to higher sunlit peaks of spiritual experience? We may condemn the claims of her papacy as unjustifiable in origin, impossible, nay hurtful, in execution, yet cannot but admire the earnestness with which the great pontiffs believed themselves to be the ministers of a higher than human righteousness. We may despise the theology of her saints, but we cannot deny that they had learned the secret of the Cross. We

¹ Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 395.

may mourn over their superstition, but cannot refuse that they had an anointing from the Holy One. We may point out the depth of their errors, their limited vision, their rude methods, their warped ideals, but these things are but the rough externals which veil but do not conceal the inward nobleness of their characters. That they without us should not be made perfect is not the condemnation of their hope, but the providential law of evolution. Considering, therefore, the issue of their life, let us imitate their faith :

JESUS CHRIST

THE SAME YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

APPENDIX



SUMMARY OF CRUSADES

- 1st. (*a*) Walter the Penniless and Peter the Hermit. Mob only.
(*b*) Godfrey, Tancred, etc. Dorylæum (1097), Antioch (1098), Jerusalem (1099).

2nd. Capture of Edessa (1145) leads Bernard to preach 2nd Crusade, under Louis VII. and Conrad III. Disasters in Phrygia, 1148.

- 3rd. The Fall of Jerusalem (Oct. 1187) by Saladin brings out
(*a*) Frederic I. Drowned at the Salef (1190).

(*b*) Richard I. and Philip Augustus. Acre, 1189;
Arsouf, 1191.

4th Crusade ends in the sack of Constantinople (1204).

5th Crusade, 1217-1230. Central figure Frederic II.; Richard of Cornwall.

6th Crusade. Final loss of Jerusalem, 1244. St. Louis in Egypt, 1248-1254. Capture of Damietta, 1248. Defeat at Mansourah, 1250, and capture of Louis.

7th Crusade. Fall of Antioch, 1268. St. Louis sails from Aigues Mortes to Tunis, 1270. Dies there, 1270. Prince Edward arrives at Acre. Returns to England, 1272. Fall of Acre, 1291. End of the "Great Debate."

A CHRONOLOGICAL CHURCH ROLL

(FROM THE DEATH OF BERNARD TO THE
DEATH OF CLEMENT V.)

B = bishop ; k = king ; f = friar ; h = heretic ; s = schoolman, etc. ;
m = monk.

Year of Accession.	Bishops of Rome. (Names in italics are those of anti-popes.)	Famous Contemporaries. (Names in italics are Emperors.)	Flourished (f.), reigned, or died (d.).
1154	Adrian IV.	<i>Frederic I. (Barbarossa).</i> Bernard of Clairvaux. Gilbert de la Porrée (s.). Henry II. of England. Arnold of Brescia (h.).	1152-1190 d. 1153 d. 1154 1154-1189 d. 1155
1159	Alexander III. 1159 <i>Victor.</i> 1164 <i>Paschal.</i> 1168 <i>Calixtus.</i>	Peter Lombard (s.). Thomas Becket (abp.). Raymund Palmaris. Richard of S. Victor (m.). Walter of S. Victor (m.). John of Salisbury (s.). Philip Augustus of France. Peter Waldo (h.). Walter de Map.	d. 1164 1162-1170 f. 1170 d. 1173 d. 1180 1115?-1180 1180-1223 f. 1184 f. 1184
1181	Lucius III.		
1185	Urban III.		
1187	Gregory VIII.		
1187	Clement III.	Richard I. of England. <i>Henry VI.</i>	1189-1199 1190-1197

Year of Accession.	Bishops of Rome. (Names in italics are those of anti-popes.)	Famous Contemporaries. (Names in italics are Emperors.)	Flourished (f.), reigned, or died (d.).
1191	Celestine III.	Gilbert of Gemblours. Walpot of Bassenheim.	f. 1190 f. 1190
		Adam of S. Victor (m.). <i>Philip IV.</i> } rivals. <i>Otto IV.</i> }	d. 1192 1197-1208
1198	Innocent III.	St. Hildegarde (m.). Averroës. John, k. of England. David of Dinant (h.). Joachim di Fiori. Moses Maimonides. Durand of Huesca. Amalric of Bena (h.). <i>Otto IV.</i> <i>Frederic II.</i>	1098-1197 1126-1198 1199-1216 f. 1200 d. 1202 1135-1204 f. 1207 d. 1207 1208-1212 1212-1250
1216	Honorius III.	Cæsar Heisterbach (m.). Simon Montfort of Toulouse. St. Dominic. St. Francis.	f. 1215 d. 1218 1170-1221 1182-1226
1227	Gregory IX.	St. Louis, k. of France. Stephen Langton (abp.). Michael Scot (h.). Matthew Paris (m.). St. Anthony of Padua. St. Elizabeth. Conrad of Marburg. Raymond Pennaforte. Brother Elias deposed.	1226-1270 1207-1228 f. 1230 f. 1230 d. 1231 1207-1231 d. 1233 f. 1234 1239
1241	Celestine IV.		
1241	<i>Interregnum.</i>	Raymond of Toulouse. Edmund Rich (abp.). James de Vitry (b.). Alexander of Hales (s.). Thomas of Celano (f.). John de Parma (f.). Peter della Vigna. <i>Conrad IV.</i>	d. 1241 1234-1244 d. 1245 d. 1245 f. 1245 f. 1247-1257 d. 1245 1250-1254
1243	Innocent IV.		

Year of Accession.	Bishops of Rome. (Names in italics are those of anti-popes.)	Famous Contemporaries. (Names in italics are Emperors.)	Flourished (f.), reigned, or died (d.).
1254	Alexander IV.	Peter Martyr (f.). Robert Grosseteste. Santa Clara (f.). <i>Interregnum.</i>	1203-1252 1175-1253 1194-1253 1254-1257
		<i>Richard of Cornwall</i> } <i>Alfonso of Castile</i> } rival	1257
		John of Parma deposed (f.).	1257
1261	Urban IV.	Ezzolino di Romano.	d. 1260
		Giovanni da Vicenza.	d. 1265
		Manfred of Sicily.	d. 1265
		Dante.	1265-1321
1265	Clement IV.	Simon de Montfort.	d. 1265
1269	<i>Interregnum.</i>	Conradin executed.	1268
1271	Gregory X.	Edward I., k. of Eng land.	1272-1307
		<i>Rudolf of Hapsburg.</i>	1273-1292
		St. Thomas Aquinas.	1224-1274
1276	Innocent V.	St. Bonaventura (b.).	1221-1274
1276	Adrian V.	Giotto the Painter.	b. 1276
1277	John XX. or XXI. (own title XXI., thereby counting Joan as a pope).		
1277	Nicholas III.		
1281	Martin IV.	Albert Magnus (s.).	1192-1280
		Guglielma (h.).	d. 1281
1285	Honorius IV.	Charles of Anjou.	d. 1284
		Philip le Bel, k. of France.	1285-1314
1289	Nicholas IV.		
1292	<i>Interregnum.</i>	<i>Adolf I. of Nassau.</i>	1292-1298
1294	Celestine V.	Robert Peckham (abp.).	1278-1294

Year of Accession.	Bishops of Rome. (Names in italics are those of anti-popes.)	Famous Contemporaries. (Names in italics are Emperors.)	Flourished (f.), reigned, or died (d.).
1294	Boniface VIII.	Roger Bacon (s.f.).	1214-1294
		Giacchimo di Voraggio.	d. 1298
		<i>Albert I. of Hapsburg.</i>	1298-1308
		Jean Pierre Olivi.	1298
		Jacopone da Todi.	f. 1298
		Ciniabue.	1240-1300
1303	Benedict XI.		
1305-1314	Clement V.		
		Segarelli burnt.	1307
		Dolcino burnt.	1307
		<i>Henry VII. of Luxembourg.</i>	1308-1314
		John Duns Scotus.	1274?-1308
		Jacques du Molay burnt.	1314
		Raymond Lullius (f.s.).	1236-1315

INDEX TO VOLUMES I. AND II.

—♦—

(For names in italics, see the Tables of Contents)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>A.E.I.O.U., ii. 38.
 Abailard, i. 217-233, 296,
 304; ii. 122, 199, 254, 255.
 Abu Bekr, ii. 50.
 Acre, Fall of, ii. 73.
 Adalbert, i. 85.
 Adelard of Bath, ii. 253.
 Adoptionism, ii. 181, 183.
 Adrian IV., i. 241, 242; ii.
 13, 16-18.
 — v., ii. 37 <i>n.</i>, 285 <i>n.</i>
 Ælfheah, i. 162.
 Aidan, i. 68.
 Alaric, i. 13, 14.
 Alberic, i. 49.
 Albert the Great, ii. 272 <i>n.</i>
 Albigensians. <i>See</i> Cathari.
 Alessandria, ii. 20.
 Alexander II., i. 119.
 — III., ii. 19-21, 238.
 Alexandria, ii. 52 <i>n.</i>
 Amalric of Bena, ii. 273.
 Amr, ii. 51.
 Anagni, ii. 294.
 Anastasius II., ii. 37 <i>n.</i>
 Angelico, Fra, ii. 231.
 <i>Anselm of Aosta</i>, i. 99, 151,
 216, 217, 230, 231; ii.
 254, 274.</p> | <p>Anselm of Laon, i. 219.
 Anskar, i. 79-81; ii. 48.
 Antwerp, ii. 179.
 Aquinas, Thomas of, ii. 8, 142,
 154, 235, 272 <i>n.</i>, 278-280.
 Arianism, i. 12, 13, 16, 21, 72.
 Aristotle, ii. 273-278.
 — and Plato, i. 208; ii. 276,
 277.
 Arnaud of Citeaux, ii. 109.
 Arnold of Brescia, i. 236-242,
 296; ii. 18, 20, 193.
 Arnulf, i. 98 <i>n.</i>
 Arthur, Romance of, ii. 196.
 Assize of Jerusalem, ii. 70.
 Attila, i. 14, 71, 252.
 Augustine of Hippo, i. 10, 15,
 207, 208; ii. 277, 279.
 Augustinian Canons, i. 275 <i>n.</i>
 Averrhoës, ii. 273, 274.
 Avicenna, ii. 273, 275.
 Avignon, ii. 39, 43, 110, 296.

 BACON, Roger, ii. 235.
 Bec, Abbey of, i. 153-157.
 Becket, Thomas, ii. 19, 21,
 125 <i>n.</i>
 Benedict of Aniane, i. 269.
 — of Nursia, i. 255, 256.</p> |
|---|--|

- Benedict ix., i. 51, 52.
 — x., i. 106.
 Berengar, i. 213.
Bernard of Clairvaux, i. 213,
 224-227, 238, 273, 277,
 279, 285; ii. 77, 85, 149,
 166, 231.
 — Clugny, i. 274, 304.
 — Menthon, i. 265.
 — the Friar, ii. 216, 226.
 Besançon, ii. 18 n.
 Beziers, ii. 109.
 Bishops and the Monasteries,
 i. 248, 252.
 Black Death, ii. 246.
 Boethius, i. 205, 206.
 Bogomils, ii. 182.
 Bohemia, i. 84, 85.
 Boleslav the Cruel, i. 85.
 — the Pious, i. 85.
 Bologna, ii. 121, 123, 258,
 260-265.
 Bonaventura, ii. 237, 272 n.
 Boniface of Germany, i. 74-
 77; ii. 48.
 Boniface vii., i. 50.
Boniface VIII., ii. 42, c. 8.
 Bouillon, Godfrey of, ii. 30,
 58, 196.
 Bouvines, ii. 23, 100 n.
 Bradwardine, ii. 279.
 Breakspear. *See* Adrian iv.

 CADALOUS, i. 109.
 Cæsar Heisterbach, ii. 109 n.,
 166, 167, 187.
 Calvin, ii. 138, 233.
 Camaldules, i. 275 n.
 Cambridge, ii. 254 n., 266 n.
Canon Law, ii. 27, c. iv.
 Canossa, i. 136; ii. 99.
 Capgrave, ii. 36.
 Cardinals, i. 108.
 Carta, Magna, ii. 99 n., 100.
 Carthusians, i. 275 n.
 Castelnau, Peter, ii. 108.
Cathari, i. 235; ii. 106-108,
 182-189.
 Celano, Thomas of, ii. 223,
 227, 228 n.
 Celestine v., ii. 37 n., 285-288.
 Celibacy of clergy, i. 124-128.
 Cencius, i. 130.
 Chaise Dieu, i. 260.
 Chalcedon, Council of, i. 12,
 15.
 Charles iv., ii. 42.
 — v., ii. 44.
 — of Anjou, ii. 284, 285.
 — Martel, i. 21, 66; ii. 55,
 62.
 — the Great, i. 5, 6, 23-
 25, 259; ii. 12, 14, 120.
 Chrodegang, i. 275 n.
 Cistercians, i. 270, 273, 274,
 291.
 Claudius of Turin, i. 234; ii.
 189.
Clement v., ii. c. 8.
 Clericis Laicos, ii. 290.
 Clovis, i. 21.
 Clugny, i. 127, 268, 271, 276.
 Cnut, i. 43, 82.
 Colonna, ii. 285, 288.
 Columba, i. 68, 70.
 Columban, i. 71, 72; ii. 138.
 Common Law, ii. 118.
 Comnenus, Alexius, ii. 65.
 — Anna, ii. 61.
 Conrad iii., i. 299.
 — of Marburg, ii. 200 n.
 Conradin, ii. 36, 285.
 Constance, Council of, i. 148;
 ii. 32, 297.
 Constance of Sicily, ii. 21, 22,
 88.

- Constantine the Great, i. 6, 9, 11.
 ——— Donation of, i. 40; ii. 18 *n.*, 89 *n.*
 Constantinople, i. 12, 17; ii. 53, 69, 72, 73, 103, 104 *n.*
 Conversion of Nations, Value of, i. 90, 91, 92.
 Corporation, Conception, ii. 118 *n.*
 Council General, Capture of, ii. 32-35.
 Courts, Christian, ii. 120, 129.
 Cromwell, ii. 154.
 Crucigeri, ii. 238.
 Crusade of the Children, ii. 219.
Crusades, i. 119 *n.*; 147, 164, 297, 298, 300; ii. 29, 30, 59, 66, 75, 178, 179.
 Cuthbert, i. 68.
 Cyprian, i. 11, 263.
 Cyril and Methodius, i. 83-85; ii. Preface, xi.
 DAMIANI, i. 54, 56, 104, 206; ii. 141.
 Dandolo, ii. 103.
 Dante, i. 29; ii. 1, 23, 25 *n.*, 31, 37 *n.*, 113, 140, 161, 205, 208, 209, 249, 251, 275, 281, 287, 295.
 David of Dinant, ii. 274.
 Decretals, False, i. 38, 252; ii. 143, 144.
 "Decretum," ii. 122.
 Diego di Azevedo, ii. 107.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, i. 222; ii. 201, 278.
 Dolcino, ii. 204.
 Dominic, ii. 75, 107, 192, 207, 208, 220, 224.
 Donation of Constantine, i. 40.
 Donatism, i. 126.
 Dorylæum, ii. 67.
 Dover, ii. 99.
 Duns Scotus, ii. 272 *n.*
 Dunstan, i. 110 *n.*
 Durand of Huesca, ii. 193.
 EADMER. *See* Anselm, ii. 176.
 Eastern Church, i. 12, 13, 67, 254, 259.
 ——— Empire, i. 10; ii. 62-65.
 Edward I., ii. 289-293.
 Elias, ii. 26, 221.
 Elizabeth of Thuringia, ii. 200 *n.*
 Empire, Theory of, i. 28, 29; ii. 11-13.
 England, Conversion of, i. 67 *sq.*
 Erigena, John Scotus, ii. 201, 202 *n.*
 Eugenius III., ii. 17.
 "Everlasting Gospel," ii. 204, 228 *n.*, 287.
 "Extravagants," ii. 123.
 FARFA, i. 57.
 Federalism in the Church, ii. 3.
 Fetichism, ii. 186-188.
 Formosus, i. 46, 47, 48.
 Fortescue, ii. 157.
Francis of Assisi, i. 120, 254, 280, 306, 307; ii. 26, 112, c. 6, 180, 192.
 Frankfurt, Council of, i. 25.
 Franks, i. 21; ii. 117.
 Frederic Barbarossa, i. 28, 33, 241; ii. 13-21, 40, 41, 72.
 ——— II., ii. 22-36, 39, 151, 256.
 Free Cities, ii. 15, 20, 21.

- Friars*, ii. 32, 150, 199, c. 6.
 Fulda, Sale of, i. 121.
 Fulk of Neuilly, ii. 102, 168.
 GALL, i. 73.
 Gallican Church, i. 75.
 Gerald Cambrensis, ii. 175 *n.*
 Germany, Church of, i. 76,
 77, 108.
 Giglio, Battle of, ii. 34.
 Giles, Brother, ii. 239, 240.
 Giotto, ii. 231.
 "Goliath," ii. 167, 168 *n.*
 Gottschalk, i. 237 *n.*; ii. 149.
 Gratian, ii. 122.
 Greek Church, i. 12, 89,
 183 *n.*; ii. 69, 70, 105.
 Greenland, Conversion of, i.
 83.
 Gregory the Great, i. 16-19,
 65, 207, 259; ii. 49.
 — II., i. 20.
 — III., i. 20, 21, 75.
 — IV., i. 33.
 — V., i. 32, 54.
 — VI., i. 52, 53, 102.
 — VII. *See* Hildebrand.
 — IX., ii. 26-29, 123, 220,
 221, 260.
 — X., ii. 37.
 Grosseteste, ii. 28, 35 *n.*, 96 *n.*,
 104 *n.*, 130 *n.*, 144 *n.*, 145,
 169, 171, 235, 259 *n.*
 Guelfs and Ghibellines, ii.
 31 *n.*, 87.
 Gui, ii. 155 *n.*
 Guilds, ii. 257.
 Gunther, i. 56.
 Gutenberg, ii. 32.
 HALES, Alexander of, ii. 141 *n.*,
 272 *n.*
 Hanno of Cologne, i. 109.
 Hansa, ii. 117.
 Hapsburgs, ii. 38, 44.
 Harding, Stephen, i. 273.
 Hegira, ii. 53 *n.*
 Heloise, i. 221, 223.
 Henry of Lausanne, i. 235.
 — I. (England), i. 184-190.
 — II. (England), ii. 17, 124.
 — III., i. 32, 53, 102, 105;
 ii. 33.
 — IV., i. 106 *sq.*
 — V., i. 143, 145.
 — VI., ii. 15, 22, 87, 92 *n.*
 Heraclius, ii. 50, 51.
 Herlouin, i. 154, 159, 160.
 Hermann of Metz, ii. 6.
Heretics and heresies, i. 235
 f.; ii. 151 *n.*, 154, 180 *n.*
 Hilary of Arles, i. 15.
Hildebrand, i. 18, 55, 56, 85,
 97, 167, 186, 193, 214; ii.
 4-8, 11, 21, 57, 59, 83,
 84, 163, 292 *n.*
 Hildegard, ii. 203.
 Hincmar of Rheims, i. 38,
 39.
 Honorius I., Heresy of, i. 32.
 — II., i. 109.
 Hospitallers, ii. 197, 303.
 Hugh of Lincoln, ii. 136,
 137 *n.*, 173.
 — Wells, ii. 173 *n.*
 Hugues de Payen, ii. 197.
 Huns, i. 78, 81, 88.
 Hus, ii. 158, 267, 279.
 ICONOCLASTIC Controversy, i.
 19, 20; ii. 63.
 Illogicalness of the Times, i.
 31, 32, 41 *n.*
 Immunity of clergy, ii.
 130-135.
 "Impetration," ii. 144.

- Indulgences, ii. 141-143.
 Innocent I., i. 14.
 — *III.*, ii. 22, 26, 79,
 c. 3, 150, 153, 158, 219, 238 *n.*
 — *IV.*, ii. 28, 29, 34,
 151 *n.*, 159.
Inquisition, ii. c. 4, 148.
 Interdicts, ii. 95, 96.
 Intolerance, ii. 75, 148, 154.
 Investitures, i. 122, 129,
 143-145, 185-187, 190.
 Ireland, Gift of, ii. 17 *n.*
 Irene, i. 5 ; ii. 12.
 Irish Church, i. 67-73 ; ii. 49.
 Irnerius, ii. 121.
Islam, i. 7, 13, 66, 77 ; ii. c. 2.

 JACOPONE da Todi, ii. 227,
 228 *n.*, 287.
 Jerome, i. 11.
 Jesuits, ii. 200.
 Jews, i. 298 ; ii. 54 *n.*
 Joachim di Fiori, ii. 25, 203,
 285.
 Joan, Pope, i. 41 *n.* ; ii. 313.
 John VIII., i. 46, 84.
 — *XII.*, i. 49.
 — *XVI.*, i. 50.
 — of England, ii. 93-101.
 Jubilee, ii. 283, 284 *n.*

 KHALID, ii. 50.
 Kilian, i. 73.

 LANFRANC, i. 155, 159, 162,
 166.
 Langton, ii. 95.
 Languedoc, ii. 106, 108, 186,
 269.
 Lateran, Second Council, i.
 108, 126, 129, 213.
 — Third Council, ii. 190.
 — Fourth Council, ii. 158.

 Legnano, ii. 20.
 Leif, i. 83.
 Leipzig, ii. 267.
 Leo, Brother, ii. 218.
 Leo the Great, i. 14, 15, 254.
 — the Isaurian, i. 19, 20 ;
 ii. 62.
 — *III.*, i. 5, 23, 24, 44.
 — *IV.*, ii. 56.
 — *IX.*, i. 103, 104, 105.
 Lewis II., i. 39.
 Lincoln, Parl. of, ii. 291.
 Lombard League, ii. 20, 21, 30.
 Lombards, i. 17, 20, 22, 109,
 135.
 Lothair, i. 39.
 Louis IX., ii. 35, 68 *n.*, 153,
 240.
 Luitgarde, ii. 111.
 Lullius, Raymond, ii. 76 *n.*,
 235.
 Luther, ii. 44, 135, 137, 154 *n.*
 Luxeuil, i. 71, 72.
 Lyons, Council of, ii. 35, 40.

 MANEGOLD, ii. 7, 8.
 Mansourah, ii. 68 *n.*
 Map, Walter, ii. 167, 168 *n.*,
 190, 196.
 Marsiglio, ii. 154 *n.*
 Martin IV., ii. 37 *n.*
 Masseo, ii. 226.
 Matilda of Tuscany, i. 109,
 133.
 Matthew of Paris, ii. 25, 26 *n.*,
 28, 95, 169 *n.*
 Metz, Council of, i. 39.
 Michael the Scot, ii. 24.
 Milan, i. 128.
 Military Orders, ii. 76,
 197-199, 302-304.
 Millennium, Anticipated Com-
 ing of, i. 59 ; ii. Preface, xi.

Miracles, ii. 126 *n.*
Missions, i. c. 3 ; ii. 47, 49, 76.
Mohammad, ii. 49, 65.
Molay, ii. 305-307.
Monasticism, i. c. 7 ; ii.
 173-178, 198-200, 301.
Mongolians, ii. 74.
Montpellier, ii. 269.
Moravia, Conversion of, i. 83.
Mortmain, ii. 290.
Mystics, ii. 200-203. •

NATIONALISM, ii. 85, 300 *f.*
Navas de Tolosa, ii. 79.
Neuss, Capitulation of, ii. 89 *n.*
Nicene Creed, ii. 119.
Nicholas I., i. 37-41 ; ii. 119.
 — II., i. 106-108.
Nominalism and Realism, i.
 210, 214 *n.*
Normans, Conversion of, i.
 77-79, 153 ; Allies of the
Papacy, 104, 107, 108, 139 ;
 ii. 57.
Norway and Sweden, Conver-
 sion of, i. 179.

OKBA, ii. 52.
Olaf the Holy, i. 82.
 — of Sweden, i. 81.
 — Tryggvason, i. 83.
Omar, ii. 51.
Ordeals, ii. 158.
Otto of Brunswick, ii. 22, 23,
 88-90, 93.
 — the Great, i. 26, 49.
 — III., i. 32.
Oxford, ii. 254 *n.*, 259 *n.*, 266 *n.*,
 269, 270.

PALLIUM, i. 16, 176, 179.
Paris, Univ. of, ii. 254-256,
 258-260, 262, 269, 270.

Paschal II., i. 144, 187, 188.
Patarines, i. 234.
Patrician of the Romans, i.
 22, 23, 109.
Paul, St., ii. 230.
Paulicians, ii. 181.
Peckham, ii. 147.
Pedro of Aragon, ii. 92.
Pelayo, ii. 53.
Penance, ii. 139-143.
Penitentials, i. 62 ; ii. 138.
Pennaforte, Raymond, ii. 123.
Peter the Great, ii. 5.
 — the Hermit, ii. 61.
 — the Venerable, i. 228, 282.
 — Lombard, i. 228 ; ii. 123.
Petrobusians, i. 235.
Philip Augustus, ii. 90, 91.
 — le Bel, ii. 289-295, 304.
 — of Germany, ii. 88-90.
Pilgrimages, i. 42, 43 ; ii. 60.
Pippin, i. 22.
Poland, Conversion of, i. 86.
 “*Policraticus*,” ii. 7.
Pongiluppo, ii. 156 *n.*
Pontius, i. 282.
Popes, Early, i. 10 ; Election
 of, by People, i. 44 ; by
 Cardinals, i. 108.
Prague, ii. 267.
Premonstrants, i. 275 *n.*
Prussians, i. 86 ; ii. 198.
Puritans, The, i. 117, 267.

RALPH, The Flambard, i. 166,
 170.
Raymond Palmaris, ii. 195.
 — of Toulouse, ii. 108, 110.
Reformation, The, i. 343 ; ii.
 441.
Relics, ii. 104 *n.*
Richard I., ii. 60 *n.*, 92 *n.*, 168.
 — of Cornwall, ii. 36.

Rockingham, i. 177, 195.
 Roderic, ii. 52.
 Roman Law, ii. 118, 119, 121,
 127, 261, 262.
 Romances of the Papacy, ii. 16.
 Rome, City of, Influence on
 Papacy, i. 4, 11, 42; Rever-
 ence for, i. 43; Anarchy of,
 i. 45, 109, 111; Sack of, i.
 140.
 Roscelin, i. 215, 221.
 Rudolf of Hapsburg, ii. 37.
 Ruffino, ii. 226.
 "Rule of Princes," ii. 8.
 Russia, Church of, i. 89.

 SALADIN, ii. 14, 71.
 Salado, ii. 52, 78.
 Salerno, ii. 253.
 Salisbury, John of, ii. 7, 18.
 Salli, ii. 69.
 Samson, Abbot, ii. 174-176.
Saracens, i. 45, 46, 140; ii. c. 2.
 Sardica, Council of, i. 13.
 Saxons, i. 138.
Scholasticism, i. c. 6; ii. c. 7.
 Sea-power, ii. 67, 68, 71.
 Sens, Council of, i. 227.
 Sicily, ii. 21, 56, 58.
 Simon Stylites, i. 254.
 Simony, i. 55, 56, 120-124.
 Slavs, Conversion of, i. 83.
 Spain, i. 16; ii. 52-54, 77-80.
 St. Victor, Adam and Richard,
 ii. 202, 203, 228 *n.*
 Stephen II., i. 22.
 — VI., i. 47.
 — IX., i. 106.
 Studium Generale, ii. 256-258.
 Suger, i. 222.
 Sylvester I., i. 9.
 — II., i. 32, 54, 98 *n.*, 204;
 ii. 59 *n.*

TANCHELM, i. 235; ii. 179.
 Templars, ii. 197, 302-305.
 Tertiaries, ii. 239.
 Teutonic knights, ii. 197.
 Theodora and Marozia, i. 48.
 Theodore of Tarsus, i. 70; ii.
 138.
 Toledo, Council of, i. 61.
 Torture, ii. 158, 159.
 Toulouse, Council of, ii. 109.
 "Translation of the Empire,"
 ii. 12.
 Transubstantiation, i. 212.
 Tribur, i. 77, 134.
 Trondhjelm, ii. 17.
 Truce of God, i. 61 *n.*
 Turks, ii. 60, 64.
 Tusculum, Counts of, i. 51,
 106.

 UGOLINI. *See* Gregory IX.
 Unam Sanctam, ii. 290.
 Universitas, ii. 257, 258.
Universities, i. 233; ii. c. 7,
 235.
 Urban II., i. 119 *n.*, 175, 177,
 179, 183; ii. 60, 65.
 — V., ii. 284.

 VALENTINIAN, i. 16.
 Venice, ii. 20 *n.*, 21, 68, 72,
 73, 103 *n.*
 Vicarages, ii. 162.
 Vicars, ii. 162, 170-173.
 Vicelin, i. 87.
 Victor II., i. 105.
 Vigna, Peter della, ii. 25.
 Villehardouin, ii. 103 *n.*
 Vitry, Jacques de, ii. 207.
 Vladimir of Russia, i. 84, 89.

 WALDENSES, ii. 189 *n.*, 190-
 194.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Waldo, ii. 189-191, 193 <i>n</i>.
 Walpot Bassenheim, ii. 198.
 Walter Penniless, ii. 67.
 Wenceslaus, i. 85.
 Wends, Attempt to convert,
 i. 86.
 Wernher von Tegernsee, ii.
 228.
 Wesley and Francis, ii. 241-
 246.
 Whitby, Synod of, i. 70.
 Wilfrid of York, i. 70.
 William the Conqueror, i. 110,
 116, 165, 167, 168.</p> | <p>William Rufus, i. 166, 169-
 185.
 Willibrord, i. 74.
 Wiscard, Robert, i. 107, 138,
 139; ii. 57, 58.
 Worms, i. 131; Concordat of,
 i. 143, 146, 191; ii. 4.
 Wyclif, i. 126; ii. 267 <i>n</i>., -
 279.
 ZARA, ii. 103.
 "Zealots," ii. 220, 221, 243,
 246.
 Zimisces, ii. 181.</p> |
|--|--|

THE END

GRAD REF 270.3 W892 v. 2


Ac. #9612

Workman, Herbert B.

The church of the West in
the middle ages

[illegible]

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
270.3 W892 v.2
Workman, Herbert B./The church of the We



3 4320 00077 2691

